arXiv:1302.5877v1 [math.AP] 24 Feb 2013

GLOBAL SMALL SOLUTIONS TO 2-D INCOMPRESSIBLE MHD SYSTEM

FANGHUA LIN, LI XU, AND PING ZHANG

Abstract. In this paper, we consider the global wellposedness of 2-D incompressible magneto-hydrodynamical system with small and smooth initial data. It is a coupled system between the Navier-Stokes equations and a free transport equation with an universal nonlinear coupling structure. The main difficulty of the proof lies in exploring the dissipative mechanism of the system due to the fact that there is a free transport equation in the system. To achieve this and to avoid the difficulty of propagating anisotropic regularity for the free transport equation, we first reformulate our system (1.1) in the Lagrangian coordinates (2.19). Then we employ anisotropic Littlewood-Paley analysis to establish the key *a priori* $L^1(\mathbb{R}^+; Lip(\mathbb{R}^2))$ estimate to the Lagrangian velocity field Y_t. With this estimate, we prove the global wellposedness of (2.19) with smooth and small initial data by using the energy method. We emphasize that the algebraic structure of (2.19) is crucial for the proofs to work. The global wellposedness of the original system (1.1) then follows by a suitable change of variables.

Keywords: Inviscid MHD system, Anisotropic Littlewood-Paley Theory, Dissipative estimates, Lagrangian coordinates

AMS Subject Classification (2000): 35Q30, 76D03

1. Introduction

In this paper, we investigate the global wellposedness of the following 2-D incompressible magneto-hydrodynamical system:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t\phi + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\phi = 0, \qquad (t,x)\in\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^2,\\ \partial_t\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{u} - \Delta\boldsymbol{u} + \nabla p = -\mathrm{div}\big[\nabla\phi\otimes\nabla\phi\big],\\ \mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{u} = 0,\\ \phi|_{t=0} = \phi_0, \quad \boldsymbol{u}|_{t=0} = \boldsymbol{u}_0, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

with initial data $(\phi_0, \boldsymbol{u}_0)$ smooth and close enough to the equilibrium state $(x_2, \boldsymbol{0})$. Here ϕ denotes the magnetic potential and $\boldsymbol{u} = (u^1, u^2)^T$, p the velocity and scalar pressure of the fluid respectively.

Recall that the general MHD system in $\mathbb{R}^d$ reads

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t\boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{b}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{u}, \qquad (t,x)\in\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^d,\\ \partial_t\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{u} - \Delta\boldsymbol{u} + \nabla p = -\frac{1}{2}\nabla|\boldsymbol{b}|^2 + \boldsymbol{b}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{b},\\ \mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{u} = \mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{b} = 0,\\ \boldsymbol{b}|_{t=0} = \boldsymbol{b}_0, \quad \boldsymbol{u}|_{t=0} = \boldsymbol{u}_0, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{b} = (b^1, \cdots, b^d)^T$ denotes the magnetic field, and $\boldsymbol{u} = (u^1, \cdots, u^d)^T$, p the velocity and scalar pressure of the fluid respectively. This MHD system (1.2) with zero diffusivity in the equation for the magnetic field can be applied to model plasmas when the plasmas are strongly collisional, or the resistivity due to these collisions are extremely small. It often

---

Date: 23/July/2012.

applies to the case when one is interested in the k-length scales that are much longer than the ion skin depth and the Larmor radius perpendicular to the field, long enough along the field to ignore the Landau damping, and time scales much longer than the ion gyration time [10, 13, 3]. In the particular case when $d = 2$ in (1.2), $\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{b} = 0$ implies the existence of a scalar function ϕ so that $\boldsymbol{b} = (\partial_2\phi, -\partial_1\phi)^T$, and the corresponding system becomes (1.1).

It is a long standing open problem that whether or not classical solutions of (1.2) can develop finite time singularities even in the 2-D case. With mixed partial dissipation and additional(artificial) magnetic diffusion in the 2-D MHD system, Cao and Wu [4] proved its global wellposedness for any data in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. We [18] proved the global wellposedness of a three dimensional version of (1.1) (not the original MHD system, for technical difficulties) with small and smooth initial data. The aim of this paper is to establish the global existence and uniqueness of small solutions to the MHD equation (1.1) in the 2-D case.

We note that the system (1.1) is of interest not only because it models the incompressible MHD equations, but also because it arises in many other important applications. Moreover, its nonlinear coupling structure is universal, see the recent survey article [15]. Indeed, the system (1.1) resembles the 2-D viscoelastic fluid system:

$$(1.3)\qquad \begin{cases} U_t + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla U = \nabla\boldsymbol{u}U, \\ \boldsymbol{u}_t + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{u} + \nabla p = \Delta\boldsymbol{u} + \nabla\cdot(UU^T), \\ \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{u} = 0, \\ U|_{t=0} = U_0, \qquad \boldsymbol{u}|_{t=0} = \boldsymbol{u}_0, \end{cases}$$

where U denotes the deformation tensor, $\boldsymbol{u}$ is the fluid velocity and p represents the hydrodynamic pressure (we refer to [16] and the references therein for more details).

In two space dimensions, when $\nabla\cdot U_0 = 0$, it follows from (1.3) that $\nabla\cdot U = 0$ for all $t > 0$. Therefore, one can find a vector $\boldsymbol{\phi} = (\phi_1, \phi_2)^T$ such that

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} -\partial_2\phi_1 & -\partial_2\phi_2 \\ \partial_1\phi_1 & \partial_1\phi_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then (1.3) can be equivalently reformulated as

$$(1.4)\qquad \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\phi}_t + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi} = \mathbf{0}, \\ \boldsymbol{u}_t + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{u} + \nabla p = \Delta\boldsymbol{u} - \sum_{i=1}^2 \operatorname{div}\left[\nabla\phi_i\otimes\nabla\phi_i\right], \\ \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{u} = 0, \\ \boldsymbol{\phi}|_{t=0} = \boldsymbol{\phi}_0, \qquad \boldsymbol{u}|_{t=0} = \boldsymbol{u}_0. \end{cases}$$

The authors ([16]) established the global existence of smooth solutions to the Cauchy problem in the entire space or on a periodic domain for (1.4) in general space dimensions provided that the initial data is sufficiently close to the equilibrium state. One sees the only difference between (1.1) and (1.4) lying in the fact that ϕ is a scalar function in (1.1), while $\boldsymbol{\phi} = (\phi_1, \phi_2)^T$ is a vector-valued function with the unit Jacobian in (1.4). However, it gives rise to an essential difficulty in the analysis. In fact, there is a damping mechanism of the system (1.4) that can be seen from the linearization of the system ∂_t (1.4):

$$(1.5)\qquad \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{tt} - \Delta\boldsymbol{\phi} - \Delta\boldsymbol{\phi}_t + \nabla q = \boldsymbol{f}, \\ \boldsymbol{u}_{tt} - \Delta\boldsymbol{u} - \Delta\boldsymbol{u}_t + \nabla p = \boldsymbol{F}, \\ \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\phi} = \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{u} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Unfortunately, for (1.1), even after some nontrivial change variables, one could at best reach (2.19) (or (2.20)) below.

Nonlinear equations with the coupling structure as (1.1) arise in many other problems such as the evolution of nematic liquid crystals, the diffusive free interface motion and the immersed boundaries in flow fields, see [15]. It is, therefore, fundamental to understand the dissipative mechanism in such a system and to develop analytical tools to handle these difficult nonlinear evolution systems.

For the incompressible MHD equations (1.2), whether there is a dissipation or not is a very important problem also from physics of plasmas. The heating of high temperature plasmas by MHD waves is one of the most interesting and challenging problems of plasma physics especially when the energy is injected into the system at the length scales much larger than the dissipative ones. It has been conjectured that in the 3-D MHD systems, energy is dissipated at a rate that is independent of the ohmic resistivity [8]. In other words, the viscosity (diffusivity) for the magnetic field equation can be zero yet the whole system may still be dissipative. We shall justify this conjecture in the two-dimensional case here.

Notice that, after substituting $\phi = x_2 + \psi$ into (1.1), one obtains the following system for $(\psi, \boldsymbol{u})$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \psi + \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \psi + u^2 = 0, \qquad (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2, \\ \partial_t u^1 + \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla u^1 - \Delta u^1 + \partial_1 \partial_2 \psi = -\partial_1 p - \operatorname{div}\big[\partial_1 \psi \nabla \psi\big] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f^1, \\ \partial_t u^2 + \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla u^2 - \Delta u^2 + (\Delta + \partial_2^2)\psi = -\partial_2 p - \operatorname{div}\big[\partial_2 \psi \nabla \psi\big] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f^2, \\ \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{u} = 0, \\ (\psi, \boldsymbol{u})|_{t=0} = (\psi_0, \boldsymbol{u}_0). \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Starting from (1.6), standard energy estimate gives rise to

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\big(\|\nabla \psi(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2\big) + \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = 0 \tag{1.7}$$

for smooth enough solutions $(\psi, \boldsymbol{u})$ of (1.6). The main difficulty to prove the global existence of small smooth solutions to (1.6) is thus to find a dissipative mechanism for ψ. Motivated by the heuristic analysis in Subsection 2.1, we shall first write the system (1.1) in the Lagrangian formulation (2.19), then we employ anisotropic Littlewood-Paley theory to capture the delicate dissipative property of Y_t in Section 3. It turns out that $\partial_{y_1} Y$ decays faster than $\partial_{y_2} Y$. This, in some sense, also justifies the necessity of using anisotropic Littlewood-Paley theory in Section 3. With the key *a priori* $L^1(\mathbb{R}^+; Lip(\mathbb{R}^2))$ estimate for Y_t, we shall prove the global wellposedness of (2.19) in Section 4.

To describe the spacial decay property of the initial data ψ_0 in (1.6), we need the following definition:

Definition 1.1. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, s \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we denote $\mathcal{A}_{k,s}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be the completion of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by the following norm:*

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{A}_{k,s}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{|\alpha| \le k} \sup_{x_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \Big(\langle x_1\rangle^s \|\partial_x^\alpha f(x_1, \cdot)\|_{L^2_v}\Big) \quad \text{for} \quad \langle x_1 \rangle = (1 + x_1^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{1.8}$$

Remark 1.1. *It is easy to see from* (C.9) *in the Appendix C that $\mathcal{A}_{k,s}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is a subspace of $H^k(\mathbb{R}^2)$ as long as $s > \frac{1}{2}$.*

We now present our main result in this paper:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $k > 3$ be an integer, $s > \frac{3}{2}$, and $s_2 \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$. Given $(\psi_0, \boldsymbol{u}_0)$ satisfying $\psi_0 \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1,s}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\boldsymbol{u}_0 \in H^k(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$,* (1.6) *has a unique global solution $(\psi, \boldsymbol{u}, p)$ (up to a constant for p) so that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\psi \in C([0,T]; H^{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)), \quad \boldsymbol{u} \in C([0,T]; H^k(\mathbb{R}^2)), \quad \nabla \boldsymbol{u} \in L^2((0,T); H^k(\mathbb{R}^2)) \\ &\nabla p \in L^2((0,T); H^{k-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)) \quad \text{for any} \quad T < \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

provided that

$$\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{k+1,s}} + \|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{k-1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2}} \leq c_0 \tag{1.10}$$

for some c_0 *sufficiently small. Furthermore, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{k-1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2})} + \|\nabla\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{k-1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2})} + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{k}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2+1})} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla\psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{k-1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2+1})} + \|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^+;L^\infty)} + \|\nabla p\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{k-2}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2})} \\ &\leq C\big(\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{k+1,s}} + \|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{k-1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2}}\big). \end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

Remark 1.2. *As* ψ *is a scalar function in* (1.6)*, we can not apply the ideas and analysis developed in* [16, 17, 7, 14] *for* (1.3) *to solve* (1.6)*. It is not a technical reason rather there is a fundamental difference between* (1.3) *and* (1.6) *which one can see from* (2.19) *or* (2.20)*. Furthermore, according to the heuristic analysis in Subsection 3.1, to find the hiding dissipation in* (1.6) *may be more tricky than the case of the classical isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes system (CNS) as it was first discussed by Danchin in* [9].

Remark 1.3. *In order to deal with a three-dimensional version of the system* (1.1)*, we* [18] *introduced the functional space* $\mathcal{B}^{s_1,s_2}$ *(see Definition 3.2 below). Due to the fundamental difficulty in propagating anisotropic regularity for the transport equations, we established the a priori* $L^1(\mathbb{R}^+;\mathcal{B}^{\frac{5}{2}-\delta,\delta})$ *(for* $\delta \in (\frac{1}{2},1)$*) estimate of* u^3*, the third component of the velocity field, in order to achieve* $L^1(\mathbb{R}^+;Lip(\mathbb{R}^3))$ *estimate of* u^3*. To obtain such an estimate, it would be essential that* $f^v \overset{def}{=} -\sum_{i,j=1}^3 \partial_3(-\Delta)^{-1}\big[\partial_i u^j\partial_j u^i + \partial_i\partial_j(\partial_i\psi\partial_j\psi)\big] - \sum_{j=1}^3 \partial_j(\partial_3\psi\partial_j\psi)$ *belonging to* $L^1(\mathbb{R}^+,\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{2}-\delta,\delta})$*. This requirement is basically equivalent to that* $f^v \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^+;\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{2}-\delta}_{2,1}(\mathbb{R}_v)(\mathcal{B}^{\delta}_{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^2_h)))$ *for* $\delta \in (\frac{1}{2},1)$*. In the corresponding 2-D case, this would require* f^2 *given by* (1.6) *belonging to* $L^1(\mathbb{R}^+;\mathcal{B}^{-\delta}_{2,1}(\mathbb{R}_v)(\mathcal{B}^{\delta}_{2,1}(\mathbb{R}_h)))$ *for* $\delta \in (\frac{1}{2},1)$*. The latter requirement is impossible due to the product laws in Besov spaces for the vertical variable. This is the key reason why we will have to use the Lagrangian formulation of* (1.1) *to prove its global wellposedness with small initial data in this paper.*

Let us complete this section by the notations we shall use in this paper.

Notation. For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$ the classical L^2 based Sobolev spaces with the norm $\|a\|_{H^s} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}(1+|\xi|^2)^s|\hat{a}(\xi)|^2\,d\xi\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, while $\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$ the classical homogenous Sobolev spaces with the norm $\|a\|_{\dot{H}^s} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|\xi|^{2s}|\hat{a}(\xi)|^2\,d\xi\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}$,. Let A, B be two operators, we denote $[A;B] = AB - BA$, the commutator between A and B. For $a \lesssim b$, we mean that there is a uniform constant C, which may be different on different lines, such that $a \leq Cb$, and $a \sim b$ means that both $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$. We shall denote by $(a \mid b)$ the $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ inner product of a and b. $(d_{j,k})_{j,k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ (resp. $(c_j)_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}$) will be a generic element of $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ (resp. $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$) so that $\sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{Z}} d_{j,k} = 1$ (resp. $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} c_j^2 = 1$). Finally, we denote by $L^p_T(L^q_h(L^r_v))$ the space $L^p([0,T];L^q(\mathbb{R}_{x_1};L^r(\mathbb{R}_{x_2})))$.

2. LAGRANGAIN FORMULATION OF THE SYSTEM (1.1)

Motivated by [22], where the authors proved the global wellposedness to a free boundary problem of (1.3) with small data through Lagrangian formulation, we shall first solve the couple system between (1.1) and the following added transport equation:

$$\partial_t\tilde{\phi} + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla_x\tilde{\phi} = 0, \quad \tilde{\phi}|_{t=0} = \tilde{\phi}_0, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\tilde{\phi}_0 = -x_1 + \tilde{\psi}_0$, and $\tilde{\psi}_0$ is determined by

$$\det U_0 = 1 \quad \text{for} \quad U_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \partial_{x_2}\psi_0 & \partial_{x_2}\tilde{\psi}_0 \\ -\partial_{x_1}\psi_0 & 1 - \partial_{x_1}\tilde{\psi}_0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.2}$$

The existence of $\tilde{\psi}_0$ will be a consequence of Lemma 6.1.

Setting $\widetilde{\phi} = -x_1 + \widetilde{\psi}$ in (2.1) yields

$$\partial_t \widetilde{\psi} + \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \widetilde{\psi} - u^1 = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\psi}|_{t=0} = \tilde{\psi}_0. \tag{2.3}$$

The main result can be stated as follows:

Theorem 2.1. *Let* $s_1 > 1$, $s_2 \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$. *Given* $(\phi_0, \tilde{\phi}_0, \boldsymbol{u}_0) \overset{\text{def}}{=} (x_2 + \psi_0, -x_1 + \tilde{\psi}_0, \boldsymbol{u}_0)$ *satisfying* $(\nabla\psi_0, \boldsymbol{u}_0) \in \dot{H}^{s_1+1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\nabla\tilde{\psi}_0 \in \dot{H}^{s_1+1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ *and* (2.2), *the coupled system* (1.1) *and* (2.1) *has a unique global solution* $(\phi, \widetilde{\phi}, \boldsymbol{u}, p) = (x_2 + \psi, -x_1 + \widetilde{\psi}, \boldsymbol{u}, p)$ *(up to a constant for* $\psi, \widetilde{\psi}, p$*) so that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla\psi \in C([0,\infty); \dot{H}^{s_1+1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)) \cap L^2((0,\infty); \dot{H}^{s_1+1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)),\\
&\nabla\widetilde{\psi} \in C([0,\infty); \dot{H}^{s_1+1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)),\\
&\boldsymbol{u} \in C([0,\infty); \dot{H}^{s_1+1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)) \cap L^2((0,\infty); \dot{H}^{s_1+2}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2+1}(\mathbb{R}^2))\\
&\qquad \cap L^1((0,\infty); Lip(\mathbb{R}^2)),\\
&\nabla p \in L^2((0,\infty); \dot{H}^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

provided that

$$\|\nabla\psi_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2}} + \|\nabla\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2+1}} + \|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2}} \leq c_0 \tag{2.5}$$

for some c_0 *sufficiently small. Furthermore, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2})} + \|\nabla\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2})} + \|\nabla\widetilde{\psi}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2+1})}\\
&\quad + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_1+2}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2+1})} + \|\nabla\psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2+1})}\\
&\quad + \|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^+;L^\infty)} + \|\nabla p\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2})}\\
&\leq C\big(\|\nabla\psi_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2}} + \|\nabla\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2+1}} + \|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2}}\big),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}^s\cap\dot{H}^{s'}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}^{s'}}$ *and* $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^s\cap\dot{H}^{s'})} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \|\cdot\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^s)} + \|\cdot\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s'})}$ *for* $p \in [1,\infty]$.

In order to avoid the difficulty of propagating anisotropic regularity for the free transport equation in the coupled system (1.1) and (2.1), we shall first write them in the Lagrangian coordinates. Indeed let $U \overset{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_2}\phi & \partial_{x_2}\tilde{\phi} \\ -\partial_{x_1}\phi & -\partial_{x_1}\tilde{\phi} \end{pmatrix}$, we deduce from (1.1) and (2.1) that U solves

$$\partial_t U + \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla_x U = \nabla_x \boldsymbol{u}\, U, \quad U|_{t=0} = U_0, \tag{2.7}$$

with U_0 being given by (2.2).

To write the nonlinear term, $\operatorname{div}\big[\nabla\phi \otimes \nabla\phi\big]$, in the momentum equation of (1.1), into a clear form in the Lagrangian formulation, we need the following lemma concerning the structure of U_0.

Lemma 2.1. *Let* $\phi_0(x) = x_2 + \psi_0(x)$, $\tilde{\phi}_0(x) = -x_1 + \tilde{\psi}_0$, *with* $\psi_0 \in \dot{H}^{\tau_1+1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{\tau_2+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\tilde{\psi}_0 \in \dot{H}^{\tau_1+1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{\tau_2+2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ *for* $\tau_1 \in (2, \infty)$, $\tau_2 \in (-1, 0)$, *and* $\|\nabla\psi_0\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L^\infty} \leq \varepsilon_0$ *for some* ε_0 *sufficiently small. Let* U_0 *satisfy* (2.2)*. Then there exists* $Y_0 = (Y_0^1, Y_0^2) \in \dot{H}^{\tau_1+1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{\tau_2+2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ *with* $\partial_1 Y_0 \in \dot{H}^{\tau_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ *so that* $X_0(y) \overset{\text{def}}{=} y + Y_0(y)$ *satisfies*

$$U_0 \circ X_0(y) = \nabla_y X_0(y) = I + \nabla_y Y_0(y). \tag{2.8}$$

Moreover, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\|Y_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\tau_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{\tau_2+2}} + \|\partial_1 Y_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\tau_2}} \\ &\leq C(\|\psi_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\tau_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{\tau_2+1}}, \|\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\tau_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{\tau_2+2}})\big(\|\psi_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\tau_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{\tau_2+1}} + \|\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\tau_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{\tau_2+2}}\big), \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where $C(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ *is a constant depending on* λ_1 *and* λ_2 *non-decreasingly.*

Proof. Let $Y = (Y^1, Y^2)$, we denote

$$\begin{cases} F(y, Y) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \psi_0(y + Y) + Y^2, \\ G(y, Y) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{\psi}_0(y + Y) - Y^1. \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

Notice from the assumption $\det U_0 = 1$ that

$$\det \frac{\partial(F, G)}{\partial(Y^1, Y^2)} = \det \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_1}\psi_0 & 1 + \partial_{x_2}\psi_0 \\ \partial_{x_1}\tilde{\psi}_0 - 1 & \partial_{x_2}\tilde{\psi}_0 \end{pmatrix} \Big|_{x=y+Y} = \det U_0(y + Y) = 1,$$

from which and the classical implicit function theorem, we deduce that around every point y, the functions $F(y, Y) = 0$ and $G(y, Y) = 0$ determines a unique function $Y_0(y) = (Y_0^1(y), Y_0^2(y))$ so that

$$F(y, Y_0(y)) = 0 = G(y, Y_0(y)),$$

or equivalently

$$Y_0^1(y) = \tilde{\psi}_0(y + Y_0(y)) \quad \text{and} \quad Y_0^2(y) = -\psi_0(y + Y_0(y)). \tag{2.11}$$

Moreover, there holds

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{y_1} Y_0^1(y) = \partial_{x_1}\tilde{\psi}_0 \circ (y + Y_0(y))(1 + \partial_{y_1} Y_0^1(y)) + \partial_{x_2}\tilde{\psi}_0 \circ (y + Y_0(y))\partial_{y_1} Y_0^2(y), \\ \partial_{y_2} Y_0^1(y) = \partial_{x_1}\tilde{\psi}_0 \circ (y + Y_0(y))\partial_{y_2} Y_0^1(y) + \partial_{x_2}\tilde{\psi}_0 \circ (y + Y_0(y))(1 + \partial_{y_2} Y_0^2(y)), \\ \partial_{y_1} Y_0^2(y) = -\partial_{x_1}\psi_0 \circ (y + Y_0(y))(1 + \partial_{y_1} Y_0^1(y)) - \partial_{x_2}\psi_0 \circ (y + Y_0(y))\partial_{y_1} Y_0^2(y), \\ \partial_{y_2} Y_0^2(y) = -\partial_{x_1}\psi_0 \circ (y + Y_0(y))\partial_{y_2} Y_0^1(y) - \partial_{x_2}\psi_0 \circ (y + Y_0(y))(1 + \partial_{y_2} Y_0^2(y)). \end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

Thanks to (2.12) and $\det U_0 = 1$, we infer

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{y_1} Y_0^1(y) = \partial_{x_2}\psi_0 \circ (y + Y_0(y)), \\ \partial_{y_2} Y_0^1(y) = \partial_{x_2}\tilde{\psi}_0 \circ (y + Y_0(y)), \\ \partial_{y_1} Y_0^2(y) = -\partial_{x_1}\psi_0 \circ (y + Y_0(y)), \\ \partial_{y_2} Y_0^2(y) = -\partial_{x_1}\tilde{\psi}_0 \circ (y + Y_0(y)), \end{cases} \tag{2.13}$$

which implies (2.8). Moreover, it follows from (2.13) that

$$\nabla_x(X_0^{-1}(x) - x) = (I + \nabla_y Y_0)^{-1} \circ X_0^{-1}(x) - I = \begin{pmatrix} -\partial_{x_1}\tilde{\psi}_0 & -\partial_{x_2}\tilde{\psi}_0 \\ \partial_{x_1}\psi_0 & \partial_{x_2}\psi_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then using Lemma A.1 with $\Phi = X_0^{-1}(x)$, we deduce from (2.13) that for $\tau_1 \in (2,\infty)$ and $\tau_2 \in (-1,0)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_y Y_0\|_{\dot H^{\tau_1}} &\leq C(\|\nabla_x\psi_0\|_{L^\infty}, \|\nabla_x\tilde\psi_0\|_{L^\infty})(1+\|\Delta_x\psi_0\|_{H^{\tau_1-2}}+\|\Delta_x\tilde\psi_0\|_{H^{\tau_1-2}})\\
&\qquad \times \big(\|\Delta_x\psi_0\|_{H^{\tau_1-1}}+\|\Delta_x\tilde\psi_0\|_{H^{\tau_1-1}}\big),\\
\|\nabla_y Y_0\|_{\dot H^{\tau_2+1}} &\leq C(\|\nabla_x\psi_0\|_{L^\infty}, \|\nabla_x\tilde\psi_0\|_{L^\infty})\big(\|\nabla_x\psi_0\|_{\dot H^{\tau_2+1}}+\|\nabla_x\tilde\psi_0\|_{\dot H^{\tau_2+1}}\big),\\
\|\partial_{y_1} Y_0\|_{\dot H^{\tau_2}} &\leq C(\|\nabla_x\psi_0\|_{L^\infty}, \|\nabla_x\tilde\psi_0\|_{L^\infty})\big(\|\nabla_x\psi_0\|_{\dot H^{\tau_2}}\\
&\qquad +(\|\nabla_x\psi_0\|_{\dot H^{\tau_2+1}}+\|\nabla_x\tilde\psi_0\|_{\dot H^{\tau_2+1}})\|\nabla_x\psi_0\|_{L^2}\big),
\end{aligned}
$$

which along with Sobolev imbedding theorem ensures (2.9). This concludes the proof of Lemma 2.1. □

With Lemma 2.1, for $(\psi_0,\tilde\psi_0)$ given by Theorem 2.1 and U_0 by (2.2), there exists $Y_0 = (Y_0^1, Y_0^2)$ so that $\nabla Y_0 \in \dot H^{s_1+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)\cap \dot H^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\partial_1 Y_0 \in \dot H^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and there holds (2.8) and (2.9). With $X_0(y) = y+Y_0(y)$ thus obtained, we define the flow map $X(t,y)$ by

$$
\begin{cases}
\dfrac{dX(t,y)}{dt} = \boldsymbol{u}(t,X(t,y)),\\
X(t,y)|_{t=0} = X_0(y),
\end{cases}
$$

and $Y(t,y)$ through

$$
X(t,y) = X_0(y) + \int_0^t \boldsymbol{u}(s,X(s,y))\,ds \overset{\text{def}}{=} y + Y(t,y). \tag{2.14}
$$

Then thanks to Proposition 1.8 of [19] and (2.8), we deduce from (2.7) that

$$
U(t,X(t,y)) = \nabla_y X(t,y) = I + \nabla_y Y(t,y) \quad\text{and}\quad \det(I+\nabla_y Y(t,y)) = 1. \tag{2.15}
$$

Denoting $U(t,X(t,y)) \overset{\text{def}}{=} (a_{ij})_{i,j=1,2}$ and $U^{-1}(t,X(t,y)) = (I+\nabla_y Y(t,y))^{-1} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (b_{ij})_{i,j=1,2}$. It is easy to check that, as $\det U = 1$, $(b_{ij})_{i,j=1,2} = \mathcal{A}_Y$ with

$$
\mathcal{A}_Y \overset{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} 1+\partial_{y_2}Y^2 & -\partial_{y_2}Y^1\\ -\partial_{y_1}Y^2 & 1+\partial_{y_1}Y^1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.16}
$$

is the adjoint matrix of $(I+\nabla_y Y)$, and $\sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\partial b_{ij}}{\partial y_i} = 0$. Furthermore, let $\boldsymbol{b} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\partial_{x_2}\phi, -\partial_{x_1}\phi)^T$, it follows from (2.15) that

$$
\boldsymbol{b}\circ X(t,y) = (1+\partial_{y_1}Y^1, \partial_{y_1}Y^2)^T \quad\text{and}\quad \mathcal{A}_Y(\boldsymbol{b}\circ X) = (1,0)^T, \tag{2.17}
$$

and consequently one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\big[-\mathrm{div}_x\,(\nabla_x\phi\otimes\nabla_x\phi) + \nabla_x(|\nabla_x\phi|^2)\big]\circ X(t,y)\\
&\qquad = [\mathrm{div}_x(\boldsymbol{b}\otimes\boldsymbol{b})]\circ X(t,y)\\
&\qquad = \nabla_y\cdot[\mathcal{A}_Y(\boldsymbol{b}\circ X)\otimes(\boldsymbol{b}\circ X)] = \partial_{y_1}(\boldsymbol{b}\circ X) = \partial_{y_1}^2 Y(t,y),
\end{aligned}
$$

that is

$$
\big[-\mathrm{div}_x(\nabla_x\phi\otimes\nabla_x\phi) + \nabla_x(|\nabla\phi|^2)\big](t,X(t,y)) = \partial_{y_1}^2 Y(t,y). \tag{2.18}
$$

With (2.14) and (2.18), we can reformulate (1.1) and (2.1) as

$$
\begin{cases}
Y_{tt} - \nabla_Y\cdot\nabla_Y Y_t - \partial_{y_1}^2 Y + \nabla_Y q = \boldsymbol{0},\\
\nabla_Y\cdot Y_t = 0,\\
Y|_{t=0} = Y_0, \quad Y_t|_{t=0} = \boldsymbol{u}_0\circ X_0(y) \overset{\text{def}}{=} Y_1,
\end{cases} \tag{2.19}
$$

where $q(t,y) = (p + |\nabla\phi|^2) \circ X(t,y)$ and $\nabla_Y = \mathcal{A}_Y^T \nabla_y$ with $\mathcal{A}_Y$ being given by (2.16). Here and in what follows, we always assume that $\|\nabla_y Y\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Under this assumption, we rewrite (2.19) as

$$\begin{cases} Y_{tt} - \Delta_y Y_t - \partial_{y_1}^2 Y = \boldsymbol{f}(Y,q), \\ \nabla_y \cdot Y = \rho(Y), \\ Y|_{t=0} = Y_0, \quad Y_t|_{t=0} = Y_1, \end{cases} \tag{2.20}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\boldsymbol{f}(Y,q) = (\nabla_Y \cdot \nabla_Y - \Delta_y) Y_t - \nabla_Y q, \\ &\rho(Y) = \nabla_y \cdot Y_0 - \int_0^t (\nabla_Y - \nabla_y) \cdot Y_s ds = \partial_{y_1} Y^2 \partial_{y_2} Y^1 - \partial_{y_1} Y^1 \partial_{y_2} Y^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

Here we have used the fact that $\det(I + \nabla_y Y_0) = \det U_0 = 1$ and (2.16) to derive the second equality of (2.21). Indeed, thanks to (2.16) and $\det(I + \nabla_y Y_0) = 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla_Y - \nabla_y) \cdot Y_t =& \frac{d}{dt}\big(\partial_{y_1} Y^1 \partial_{y_2} Y^2 - \partial_{y_1} Y^2 \partial_{y_2} Y^1\big) \\ =& \frac{d}{dt}\big(\det(I + \nabla_y Y) - 1 - \nabla_y \cdot Y\big). \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

Furthermore, (2.22) ensures that the equation $\nabla_y \cdot Y = \rho(Y)$ would imply $\det(I + \nabla_y Y) = 1$ and $\nabla_Y \cdot Y_t = 0$.

For notational convenience, we shall neglect the subscripts x or y in ∂, ∇ and Δ in what follows. We make the convention that whenever ∇ acts on $(\psi, \boldsymbol{u}, p)$, which is a solution to (1.6), we understand $(\nabla\psi, \nabla\boldsymbol{u}, \nabla p)$ as $(\nabla_x\psi, \nabla_x\boldsymbol{u}, \nabla_x p)$. While ∇ acts on (Y, q), the solution to (2.20), we understand $(\nabla Y, \nabla q)$ as $(\nabla_y Y, \nabla_y q)$. Similar conventions for ∂ and Δ.

For (2.20)-(2.21), we have the following global wellposedness result:

Theorem 2.2. *Let $s_1 > 1$, $s_2 \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$. Let (Y_0, Y_1) satisfy $(\partial_1 Y_0, \Delta Y_0) \in \dot{H}^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $Y_1 \in \dot{H}^{s_1+1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and*

$$\det(I + \nabla Y_0) = 1, \quad \nabla_{Y_0} \cdot Y_1 = 0, \quad \textit{and} \tag{2.23}$$

$$\|\partial_1 Y_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_2}} + \|\Delta Y_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}} + \|Y_1\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}} \leq \varepsilon_0 \tag{2.24}$$

for some ε_0 sufficiently small. Then (2.20)-(2.21) has a unique global solution (Y, q) (up to a constant for q) so that

$$\begin{aligned} &Y \in C([0,\infty); \dot{H}^{s_1+2} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2+2}(\mathbb{R}^2)) \quad \textit{and} \quad Y^2 \in C([0,\infty); \dot{H}^{s_2+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)), \\ &\partial_1 Y \in C([0,\infty); \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{s_1+1} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)), \\ &Y_t \in C([0,\infty); \dot{H}^{s_1+1} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{s_1+2} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^+; Lip(\mathbb{R}^2)), \\ &\nabla q \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{s_1} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{s_1} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

Moreover, there hold $\det(I + \nabla Y) = 1$, $\nabla_Y \cdot Y_t = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|Y\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{s_1+2} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2+2})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{s_2})} + \|Y^2\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{s_2+1})} \\ &\quad + \|Y_t\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{s_1+1} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{s_1+1} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2+1})} + \|Y_t\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{s_1+2} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2+1})} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla Y_t\|^2_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^+; L^\infty)} + \|\nabla q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{s_1} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2})} + \|\nabla q\|^2_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^+; \dot{H}^{s_1} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2})} \\ &\leq C\big(\|\partial_1 Y_0\|^2_{\dot{H}^{s_2}} + \|\Delta Y_0\|^2_{\dot{H}^{s_1} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}} + \|Y_1\|^2_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1} \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}}\big). \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Remark 2.1. *As for the Eulerian formulation* (1.6)*, it is also rather technical to explore the delicate mechanism of partial dissipations in* (2.20)*. We overcome this difficulty by applying the anisotropic Littlewood-Paley theory. However, as we use the Lagrangian formulation* (2.20) *instead of Eulerian one* (1.6)*, we actually avoid the difficulty concerning the propagation anisotropic regularity for the transport equation, which we encountered in* [18]*. In general, it is interesting to see how the anisotropic Littlewood-Paley theory can be applied to these evolution equations with degenerations of certain ellipticity (parabolicity) in phase variables.*

Remark 2.2. *We note once again that the equation* $\nabla\cdot Y=\rho(Y)=\partial_1Y^2\partial_2Y^1-\partial_1Y^1\partial_2Y^2$*, which implies the incompressibility condition* $\det(I+\nabla Y)=1$*, plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 2.2. In particular, this equation ensures the global in time* L^1*-estimates of* ∇q *and* ∇Y_t*, which is crucial to close the energy estimates for* (2.20)-(2.21)*. Furthermore, this equation provides better estimates for the component* Y^2 *than that of* Y^1*.*

Scheme of the proofs.

To avoid the difficulty caused by propagating anisotropic regularity for the free transport equation, we shall first prove Theorem 2.2, which concerns the global wellposedness in the Lagrangian formulation (2.20)-(2.21) for the coupled system (1.1) and (2.1).

Indeed let (Y,q) be a smooth enough solution of (2.20), applying standard energy estimate to (2.20) gives rise to

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\Big\{\frac12\big(\|Y_t\|_{\dot H^s}^2+\|Y_t\|_{\dot H^{s+1}}^2+\|\partial_1Y\|_{\dot H^s}^2+\|\partial_1Y\|_{\dot H^{s+1}}^2+\frac14\|Y\|_{\dot H^{s+2}}^2\big)-\frac14(Y_t\mid\Delta Y)_{\dot H^s}\Big\}\\&\qquad+\frac34\|Y_t\|_{\dot H^{s+1}}^2+\|Y_t\|_{\dot H^{s+2}}^2+\frac14\|\partial_1Y\|_{\dot H^{s+1}}^2\\&\qquad=\big(\boldsymbol{f}\mid Y_t-\frac14\Delta Y-\Delta Y_t\big)_{\dot H^s}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.27}$$

where $\boldsymbol{f}$ is given by (2.21) and $(a\mid b)_{\dot H^s}$ denotes the standard $\dot H^s$ inner product of a and b. (2.27) shows that ∂_1Y belongs to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^2))$. After a careful check, to close the energy estimate (2.27), we need also the $L^1(\mathbb{R}^+;Lip(\mathbb{R}^2))$ estimate of Y_t. Toward this, we investigate first the spectrum properties to the following linearized system of (2.20)-(2.21):

$$\begin{cases}Y_{tt}-\Delta Y_t-\partial_1^2Y=\boldsymbol{f},\\ Y|_{t=0}=Y_0,\quad Y_t|_{t=0}=Y_1.\end{cases}\tag{2.28}$$

Simple calculation shows that the symbolic equation of (2.28) has eigenvalues $\lambda_\pm(\xi)$ given by (3.1) and they satisfy (3.2). This shows that smooth solution of (2.28) decays in a very subtle way. In order to capture this delicate decay property for the solutions of (2.28), we will have to decompose our frequency analysis into two parts: $\big\{\xi=(\xi_1,\xi_2):\ |\xi|^2\le2|\xi_1|\ \big\}$ and $\big\{\xi=(\xi_1,\xi_2):\ |\xi|^2>2|\xi_1|\ \big\}$. It suggests us to use anisotropic Littlewood-Paley analysis to obtain the $L^1(\mathbb{R}^+,Lip(\mathbb{R}^2))$ estimate of Y_t.

With Theorem 2.2, we can prove Theorem 2.1 through coordinate transformation, namely from Lagrangian coordinates to Eulerian ones. Finally thanks to Lemma 6.1, for $s>\frac32$ and ψ_0 being small in $\mathcal{A}_{k+1,s}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, there exists $\widetilde{\psi}_0$ so that there hold (2.2) and (6.16). We thus obtained $(\psi_0,\widetilde{\psi}_0)$ and the initial velocity field u_0 given by Theorem 1.1, we infer from Theorem 2.1 that the coupled system between (1.1) and (2.1) has a unique solution $(\phi,\widetilde{\phi},\boldsymbol{u},p)$, which satisfies (2.4) and (2.6). In particular, $(\phi,\boldsymbol{u},p)$ solves (1.1) and we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the first part of Section 3, we shall present a heuristic analysis to the linearized system of (2.20)-(2.21), which motivates us to use anisotropic Littlewood-Paley theory below, then we shall collect some basic facts on Littlewood-Paley analysis in Subsection 3.2. In Section 4, we apply anisotropic Littlewood-Paley theory to explore the dissipative mechanism for a linearized model of (2.20)-(2.21). In Section 5, we present the proof of Theorem 2.2 and then Theorems 2.1 and 1.1 in Section 6. Finally, we present the proofs of some technical lemmas in the Appendices.

3. PRELIMINARY

3.1. **Spectral analysis to the linearized system of** (2.20)**.** Before dealing with the full system (2.20) and (2.21), we shall make some heuristic analysis to the linearized system (2.28). Observe that the symbolic equation of (2.28) reads

$$\lambda^2+|\xi|^2\lambda+\xi_1^2=0 \quad \text{for} \quad \xi=(\xi_1,\xi_2).$$

It is easy to calculate that this equation has two different eigenvalues

$$\lambda_\pm=-\frac{|\xi|^2\pm\sqrt{|\xi|^4-4\xi_1^2}}{2}. \tag{3.1}$$

The Fourier modes corresponding to λ_+ decays like $e^{-t|\xi|^2}$. Whereas the decay property of the Fourier modes corresponding to λ_- varies with directions of ξ as

$$\lambda_-(\xi)=-\frac{2\xi_1^2}{|\xi|^2\bigl(1+\sqrt{1-\frac{4\xi_1^2}{|\xi|^4}}\bigr)}\to -1 \quad \text{as} \quad |\xi|\to\infty \tag{3.2}$$

only in the ξ_1 direction. This simple analysis shows that the dissipative properties of the solutions to (2.28) may be more complicated than that for the linearized system of isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes system in [9]. It also suggests us to employ the tool of anisotropic Littlewood-Paley theory, which has been used in the study of the global wellposedness to 3-D anisotropic incompressible Navier-Stokes equations [5, 6, 11, 12, 20, 21, 23], and in [18] to explore the dissipative properties to the three-dimensional case of (1.6). One may check Section 4 below for the detailed rigorous analysis corresponding to this scenario.

3.2. **Littlewood-Paley theory.** The proof of Theorem 2.1 requires a dyadic decomposition of the Fourier variables, or the Littlewood-Paley decomposition. For the convenience of the readers, we recall some basic facts on Littlewood-Paley theory from [1]. Let φ and χ be smooth functions supported in $\mathcal{C}\overset{\text{def}}{=}\{\tau\in\mathbb{R}^+,\ \frac{3}{4}\leq\tau\leq\frac{8}{3}\}$ and $\mathcal{B}\overset{\text{def}}{=}\{\tau\in\mathbb{R}^+,\ \tau\leq\frac{4}{3}\}$ such that

$$\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\varphi(2^{-j}\tau)=1 \quad \text{for} \quad \tau>0 \quad \text{and} \quad \chi(\tau)+\sum_{j\geq0}\varphi(2^{-j}\tau)=1.$$

For $a\in\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we set

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta_k^h a\overset{\text{def}}{=}\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi(2^{-k}|\xi_1|)\widehat{a}), &&S_k^h a\overset{\text{def}}{=}\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\chi(2^{-k}|\xi_1|)\widehat{a}),\\
&\Delta_\ell^v a\overset{\text{def}}{=}\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi(2^{-\ell}|\xi_2|)\widehat{a}), &&S_\ell^v a\overset{\text{def}}{=}\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\chi(2^{-k}|\xi_2|)\widehat{a}), \quad \text{and}\\
&\Delta_j a\overset{\text{def}}{=}\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\varphi(2^{-j}|\xi|)\widehat{a}), &&S_j a\overset{\text{def}}{=}\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\chi(2^{-k}|\xi|)\widehat{a}),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where $\mathcal{F}a$ and $\widehat{a}$ denote the Fourier transform of the distribution a. The dyadic operators defined in (3.3) satisfy the property of almost orthogonality:

$$\Delta_k\Delta_j a\equiv0 \quad \text{if} \quad |k-j|\geq2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_k(S_{j-1}a\Delta_j b)\equiv0 \quad \text{if} \quad |k-j|\geq5. \tag{3.4}$$

Similar properties hold for Δ_k^h and Δ_ℓ^v.

In what follows, we shall frequently use the following anisotropic type Bernstein inequalities:

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{B}_h$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_v$) a ball of $\mathbb{R}_h$ (resp. $\mathbb{R}_v$), and $\mathcal{C}_h$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}_v$) a ring of $\mathbb{R}_h$ (resp. $\mathbb{R}_v$); let $1 \le p_2 \le p_1 \le \infty$ and $1 \le q_2 \le q_1 \le \infty$. Then there holds:*
If the support of $\widehat{a}$ is included in $2^k\mathcal{B}_h$, then

$$\|\partial_{x_1}^\alpha a\|_{L_h^{p_1}(L_v^{q_1})} \lesssim 2^{k\left(\alpha+\left(\frac{1}{p_2}-\frac{1}{p_1}\right)\right)}\|a\|_{L_h^{p_2}(L_v^{q_1})}.$$

If the support of $\widehat{a}$ is included in $2^\ell\mathcal{B}_v$, then

$$\|\partial_{x_2}^\beta a\|_{L_h^{p_1}(L_v^{q_1})} \lesssim 2^{\ell(\beta+(\frac{1}{q_2}-\frac{1}{q_1}))}\|a\|_{L_h^{p_1}(L_v^{q_2})}.$$

If the support of $\widehat{a}$ is included in $2^k\mathcal{C}_h$, then

$$\|a\|_{L_h^{p_1}(L_v^{q_1})} \lesssim 2^{-kN}\|\partial_{x_1}^N a\|_{L_h^{p_1}(L_v^{q_1})}.$$

If the support of $\widehat{a}$ is included in $2^\ell\mathcal{C}_v$, then

$$\|a\|_{L_h^{p_1}(L_v^{q_1})} \lesssim 2^{-\ell N}\|\partial_{x_2}^N a\|_{L_h^{p_1}(L_v^{q_1})}.$$

Definition 3.1. *Let $(p,r) \in [1,+\infty]^2$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we set*

$$\|u\|_{\dot{B}^s_{p,r}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \big(2^{qs}\|\Delta_q u\|_{L^p}\big)_{\ell^r}.$$

- *For $s < \frac{2}{p}$ (or $s = \frac{2}{p}$ if $r = 1$), we define $\dot{B}^s_{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2) \mid \|u\|_{\dot{B}^s_{p,r}} < \infty\}$.*
- *If $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\frac{2}{p} + k - 1 \le s < \frac{2}{p} + k$ (or $s = \frac{2}{p} + k$ if $r = 1$), then $\dot{B}^s_{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is defined as the subset of distribution $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\partial^\beta u \in \dot{B}^{s-k}_{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ whenever $|\beta| = k$.*

Remark 3.1. *(1) It is easy to observe that $\dot{B}^s_{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^2) = \dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$.*

(2) Let $(p,r) \in [1,+\infty]^2$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then $u \in \dot{B}^s_{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ if and only if there exists $\{c_{j,r}\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $\|c_{j,r}\|_{\ell^r} = 1$ and

$$\|\Delta_j u\|_{L^p} \le C c_{j,r} 2^{-js}\|u\|_{\dot{B}^s_{p,r}} \quad \text{for all} \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

(3) Let $s, s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $s_1 < s < s_2$ and $u \in \dot{H}^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then $u \in \dot{B}^s_{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and there holds

$$\|u\|_{\dot{B}^s_{2,1}} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1}}^{\frac{s_2-s}{s_2-s_1}}\|u\|_{\dot{H}^{s_2}}^{\frac{s-s_1}{s_2-s_1}} \lesssim \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1}} + \|u\|_{\dot{H}^{s_2}}. \tag{3.5}$$

To derive the $L^1(\mathbb{R}^+; Lip(\mathbb{R}^2))$ estimate of Y_t determined by (2.28), we need the following two-dimensional version of the anisotropic Besov type space introduced in [18]:

Definition 3.2. *Let $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we define the norm*

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_1,s_2}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{Z}^2} 2^{js_1}2^{ks_2}\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h u\|_{L^2}.$$

Then motivated by the proof of Lemma 2.1 in [18], we have the following improved version:

Lemma 3.2. *Let $s_1, s_2, \tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, which satisfy $s_1 < \tau_1 + \tau_2 < s_2$ and $\tau_2 > 0$. Then for $a \in \dot{H}^{s_1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \dot{H}^{s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $a \in \mathcal{B}^{\tau_1,\tau_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and there holds*

$$\|a\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\tau_1,\tau_2}} \lesssim \|a\|_{\dot{B}^{\tau_1+\tau_2}_{2,1}} \lesssim \|a\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1}} + \|a\|_{\dot{H}^{s_2}}.$$

Proof. Indeed thanks to Definition 3.2 and the fact: $j \geq k - N_0$ for some fixed positive integer N_0 in dyadic operator $\Delta_j \Delta_k^h$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|a\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\tau_1,\tau_2}} &= \sum_{k \leq j+N_0} 2^{j\tau_1} 2^{k\tau_2} \|\Delta_j \Delta_k^h a\|_{L^2}\\ &\lesssim \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{j\tau_1} \|\Delta_j a\|_{L^2} \sum_{k\leq j+N_0} 2^{k\tau_2}\\ &\lesssim \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{j(\tau_1+\tau_2)} \|\Delta_j a\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|a\|_{\dot{B}^{\tau_1+\tau_2}_{2,1}},\end{aligned}$$

which together with (3.5) completes the proof of the lemma. □

In order to obtain a better description of the regularizing effect of the transport-diffusion equation, we will use Chemin-Lerner type spaces $\widetilde{L}^\lambda_T(B^s_{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^2))$ (see [1] for instance).

Definition 3.3. *Let $(r, \lambda, p) \in [1, +\infty]^3$ and $T \in (0, +\infty]$. We define the $\widetilde{L}^\lambda_T(\dot{B}^s_{p,r}(\mathbb{R}^2))$ norm by*

$$\|u\|_{\widetilde{L}^\lambda_T(\dot{B}^s_{p,r})} \overset{def}{=} \Big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{jrs} \big(\int_0^T \|\Delta_j u(t)\|^\lambda_{L^p}\, dt\big)^{\frac{r}{\lambda}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{r}} < \infty,$$

with the usual change if $r = \infty$. For short, we just denote this space by $\widetilde{L}^\lambda_T(\dot{B}^s_{p,r})$.

Remark 3.2. *Corresponding to Definitions 3.2 and 3.3, we define the norm*

$$\|u\|_{\widetilde{L}^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{s_1,s_2})} \overset{def}{=} \sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{js_1} 2^{ks_2} \|\Delta_j \Delta_k^h u\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}.$$

Then it follows from the proof of Lemma 3.2 that

$$\|u\|_{\widetilde{L}^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\tau_1,\tau_2})} \lesssim \|u\|_{\widetilde{L}^2_T(\dot{B}^{\tau_1+\tau_2}_{2,1})} \lesssim \|u\|_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^{s_1})} + \|u\|_{L^2(\dot{H}^{s_2})}, \tag{3.6}$$

with τ_1, τ_2 and s_1, s_2 satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 3.2.

We also need both the isotropic and anisotropic versions of para-differential decomposition of Bony [2]. We first recall the isotropic para-differential decomposition from [2]: let $a, b \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned}& ab = T(a,b) + \mathcal{R}(a,b), \quad \text{or} \quad ab = T(a,b) + \bar{T}(a,b) + R(a,b), \quad \text{where}\\ & T(a,b) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} S_{j-1} a \Delta_j b, \quad \bar{T}(a,b) = T(b,a), \quad \mathcal{R}(a,b) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \Delta_j a S_{j+2} b, \quad \text{and}\\ & R(a,b) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \Delta_j a \tilde{\Delta}_j b, \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{\Delta}_j b = \sum_{\ell=j-1}^{j+1} \Delta_\ell b.\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

We shall also use the following anisotropic version of Bony's decomposition for the horizontal variables:

$$\begin{aligned}& ab = T^h(a,b) + \mathcal{R}^h(a,b), \quad \text{or} \quad ab = T^h(a,b) + \bar{T}^h(a,b) + R^h(a,b), \quad \text{where}\\ & T^h(a,b) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} S^h_{k-1} a \Delta^h_k b, \quad \bar{T}^h(a,b) = T^h(b,a), \quad \mathcal{R}^h(a,b) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \Delta^h_k a S^h_{k+2} b, \quad \text{and}\\ & R^h(a,b) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \Delta^h_k a \tilde{\Delta}^h_k b, \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{\Delta}^h_k b = \sum_{\ell=k-1}^{k+1} \Delta^h_\ell b.\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Considering the special structure of the functions in $\mathcal{B}^{s_1,s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we sometime use both (3.7) and (3.8) simultaneously.

As an application of the above basic facts on Littlewood-Paley theory, we prove the following product law in space $\mathcal{B}^{s_1,s_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ given by Definition 3.2.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $s_1, s_2, \tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, which satisfy $s_1, s_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\tau_1, \tau_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $s_1 + s_2 > 0$, $\tau_1 + \tau_2 > 0$. Then for $a \in \mathcal{B}^{s_1,\tau_1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}^{s_2,\tau_2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $ab \in \mathcal{B}^{s_1+s_2-\frac{1}{2},\tau_1+\tau_2-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and there holds*

$$\|ab\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_1+s_2-\frac{1}{2},\tau_1+\tau_2-\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|a\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_1,\tau_1}} \|b\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_2,\tau_2}}. \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. We first get by using Bony's decompositions (3.7) and (3.8) that

$$ab = \big(TT^h + T\bar{T}^h + TR^h + \bar{T}T^h + \bar{T}\bar{T}^h + \bar{T}R^h + RT^h + R\bar{T}^h + RR^h\big)(a,b). \tag{3.10}$$

We shall present the detailed estimates to typical terms above. Indeed applying Lemma 3.1 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h(TR^h(a,b))\|_{L^2} &\lesssim 2^{\frac{k}{2}} \sum_{\substack{|j'-j|\leq 4\\ k'\geq k-N_0}} \|S_{j'-1}\Delta_{k'}^h a\|_{L_h^\infty(L_v^2)} \|\Delta_{j'}\widetilde{\Delta}_{k'}^h b\|_{L^2}\\
&\lesssim 2^{\frac{k}{2}} \sum_{\substack{|j'-j|\leq 4\\ k'\geq k-N_0}} d_{j',k'} 2^{j'(\frac{1}{2}-s_1-s_2)} 2^{-k'(\tau_1+\tau_2)} \|a\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_1,\tau_1}} \|b\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_2,\tau_2}}\\
&\lesssim d_{j,k} 2^{-j(s_1+s_2-\frac{1}{2})} 2^{-k(\tau_1+\tau_2-\frac{1}{2})} \|a\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_1,\tau_1}} \|b\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_2,\tau_2}},
\end{aligned}$$

as $\tau_1 + \tau_2 > 0$ and $s_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ so that $\|S_{j'-1}\Delta_{k'}^h a\|_{L_h^\infty(L_v^2)} \lesssim 2^{j'(\frac{1}{2}-s_1)} 2^{-k'\tau_1} \|a\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_1,\tau_1}}$. The same estimate holds for $\Delta_j\Delta_k^h(\bar{T}R^h(a,b))$.

Along the same line, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h(RR^h(a,b))\|_{L^2} &\lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} 2^{\frac{k}{2}} \sum_{\substack{j'\geq j-N_0\\ k'\geq k-N_0}} \|\Delta_{j'}\Delta_{k'}^h a\|_{L^2} \|\widetilde{\Delta}_{j'}\widetilde{\Delta}_{k'}^h b\|_{L^2}\\
&\lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} 2^{\frac{k}{2}} \sum_{\substack{j'\geq j-N_0\\ k'\geq k-N_0}} d_{j',k'} 2^{-j'(s_1+s_2)} 2^{-k'(\tau_1+\tau_2)} \|a\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_1,\tau_1}} \|b\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_2,\tau_2}}\\
&\lesssim d_{j,k} 2^{-j(s_1+s_2-\frac{1}{2})} 2^{-k(\tau_1+\tau_2-\frac{1}{2})} \|a\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_1,\tau_1}} \|b\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_2,\tau_2}}
\end{aligned}$$

due to the fact: $s_1 + s_2 > 0$ and $\tau_1 + \tau_2 > 0$. The estimate to the remaining terms in (3.10) is identical, and we omit the details here.

Whence thanks to (3.10), we arrive at

$$\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h(ab)\|_{L^2} \lesssim d_{j,k} 2^{-j(s_1+s_2-\frac{1}{2})} 2^{-k(\tau_1+\tau_2-\frac{1}{2})} \|a\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_1,\tau_1}} \|b\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s_2,\tau_2}},$$

which implies (3.9). This concludes the proof of Lemma 3.3. □

We finish this section by some product laws in $\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\dot{B}^s_{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ (see [1] for instance):

Lemma 3.4. *For any $s > -1$, there hold*

(i) $\|ab\|_{\dot{H}^s} \lesssim \|a\|_{L^\infty} \|b\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \|a\|_{\dot{H}^s} \|b\|_{L^\infty}$, *for* $s > 0$;

(ii) $\|ab\|_{\dot{H}^s} \lesssim \|a\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}} \|b\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \langle \|a\|_{\dot{H}^s} \|b\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}} \rangle_{s>1}$;

(iii) $\|ab\|_{\dot{H}^s} \lesssim \|a\|_{L^\infty} \|b\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \|a\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}} \|b\|_{L^2}$,

where the notation $A_s = B_s + \langle C_s \rangle_{s>s_0}$ means $A_s = B_s$ if $s \leq s_0$ and $A_s = B_s + C_s$ if $s > s_0$.

Lemma 3.5. *For any $s>-1$, there hold*

(i) $\|ab\|_{\dot B^s_{2,1}}\lesssim\|a\|_{\dot B^1_{2,1}}\|b\|_{\dot B^s_{2,1}}+\langle\|a\|_{\dot B^s_{2,1}}\|b\|_{\dot B^1_{2,1}}\rangle_{s>1}$;

(ii) $\|ab\|_{\dot B^s_{2,1}}\lesssim\|a\|_{\dot B^1_{2,1}}\|b\|_{\dot B^s_{2,1}}+\|a\|_{\dot B^{s+1}_{2,1}}\|b\|_{L^2}$.

4. $L^1_T(Lip)$ ESTIMATE OF Y_t

As it is well-known, the existence of solutions to a nonlinear partial differential equation follows essentially from the uniform estimates for its appropriate approximate solutions. In Subsection 5.3, we shall present the uniform global estimates to the approximate solutions of (2.20)-(2.21) provided that the initial data (Y_0,Y_1) satisfies (2.23) and (2.24), and hence the proof of Theorem 2.2. Toward this, a key ingredient used in Section 5.3 will be the $L^1(\mathbb{R}^+;Lip(\mathbb{R}^2))$ estimate of Y_t. And this is the purpose of this section.

4.1. The $\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)}$ estimate for solutions of (2.28).

We first investigate the $\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)}$ estimate on solutions of the linear equation (2.28).

Proposition 4.1. *Let Y be a sufficiently smooth solution of (2.28) on $[0,T]$. Then there holds*

$$\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)}\lesssim\|Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12})}\lesssim\|Y_1\|_{\mathcal{B}^{-\frac12,\frac12}}+\|\partial_1Y_0\|_{\mathcal{B}^{-\frac12,\frac12}}+\|\Delta Y_0\|_{\mathcal{B}^{-\frac12,\frac12}}+\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Applying operator $\Delta_j\Delta_k^h$ to (2.28), we first get that

$$\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_{tt}-\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t-\partial_1^2\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY=\Delta_j\Delta_k^h\boldsymbol{f}. \tag{4.2}$$

Taking the L^2 inner product of (4.2) with $\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t$ gives

$$\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\Big(\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_1\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\|_{L^2}^2\Big)+\|\nabla\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\|_{L^2}^2=(\Delta_j\Delta_k^h\boldsymbol{f}\mid\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t). \tag{4.3}$$

While taking the L^2 inner product of (4.2) with $\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY$ leads to

$$(\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_{tt}\mid\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY)-\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\|_{L^2}^2-\|\partial_1\nabla\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\|_{L^2}^2=(\Delta_j\Delta_k^h\boldsymbol{f}\mid\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY).$$

Notice that

$$(\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_{tt}\mid\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY)=\frac{d}{dt}(\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\mid\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY)-(\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\mid\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t),$$

hence there holds that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\Big(\frac12\|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\|_{L^2}^2-(\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\mid\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY)\Big)-\|\nabla\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_1\nabla\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\|_{L^2}^2\\&=-(\Delta_j\Delta_k^h\boldsymbol{f}\mid\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY).\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Summing up (4.3) with $\frac14\times$(4.4) gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}g_{j,k}(t)^2+\frac34\|\nabla\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\|_{L^2}^2+\frac14\|\partial_1\nabla\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\|_{L^2}^2\\&=\big(\Delta_j\Delta_k^h\boldsymbol{f}\mid\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t-\frac14\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\big),\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}g_{j,k}(t)^2\overset{\text{def}}{=}&\frac12\big(\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_1\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\frac14\|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2\big)\\&-\frac14\big(\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\mid\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\big).\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that

$$\frac{1}{4}\big|\big(\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t \mid \Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\big)\big| \le \frac{1}{16}\|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{4}\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{4}\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial_1\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{16}\|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2\\ &\qquad \le g_{j,k}(t)^2 \le \frac{3}{4}\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial_1\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{3}{16}\|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2,\end{aligned}$$

or equivalently

$$g_{j,k}(t)^2 \sim \|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_1\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{4.6}$$

With (4.5) and (4.6), and according to the heuristic analysis in Section 2, we shall divide the proof of (4.1) into two cases: one is when $j \le \frac{k+1}{2}$, and the other one is when $j > \frac{k+1}{2}$.

Case (1): when $j \le \frac{k+1}{2}$. In this case, we infer from Lemma 3.1 and (4.6) that

$$g_{j,k}(t)^2 \sim \|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_1\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\nabla\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_1\nabla\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2\\ &\qquad \ge c2^{2j}\big(\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_1\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2\big) \ge c2^{2j}g_{j,k}(t)^2,\end{aligned}$$

from which, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, dividing (4.5) by $g_{j,k}(t) + \varepsilon$, then taking $\varepsilon \to 0$ and integrating the resulting equation over $[0,T]$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)} + \|\partial_1\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}\\ &\quad + c2^{2j}\big(\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\|_{L^1_T(L^2)} + \|\partial_1\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}\big)\\ &\lesssim \|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_1\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_1\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_0\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h\boldsymbol{f}\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Case (2): when $j > \frac{k+1}{2}$. In this case, we apply Lemma 3.1 to obtain that

$$g_{j,k}(t)^2 \sim \|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\nabla\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_1\nabla\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2\\ &\qquad \ge c\frac{2^{2k}}{2^{2j}}\big(\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY(t)\|_{L^2}^2\big) \ge c\frac{2^{2k}}{2^{2j}}g_{j,k}(t)^2,\end{aligned}$$

from these and (4.5), we deduce by a similar argument for (4.7) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)} + \|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}\\ &\quad + c\frac{2^{2k}}{2^{2j}}\big(\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\|_{L^1_T(L^2)} + \|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}\big)\\ &\lesssim \|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_1\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_0\|_{L^2} + \|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h\boldsymbol{f}\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

On the other hand, via (4.3), one has

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t(t)\|_{L^2}^2 = \big(\partial_1^2\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY + \Delta_j\Delta_k^h\boldsymbol{f} \mid \Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\big),$$

from this, Lemma 3.1 and (4.8), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}+c2^{2j}\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}\\ &\quad\leq\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_1\|_{L^2}+C\bigl(2^{2k}\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}+\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h\boldsymbol{f}\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}\bigr)\\ &\quad\lesssim\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_1\|_{L^2}+\|\Delta\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_0\|_{L^2}+\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h\boldsymbol{f}\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}\quad\text{for}\quad j>\frac{k+1}{2}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

By Definition 3.2, we get, by combining (4.7) with (4.9), that

$$\|Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}})}\lesssim\|Y_1\|_{\mathcal{B}^{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}}+\|\partial_1Y_0\|_{\mathcal{B}^{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}}+\|\Delta Y_0\|_{\mathcal{B}^{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}}+\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})},$$

which together with the fact

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)}&\lesssim\sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h\nabla Y_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)}\\ &\lesssim\sum_{\substack{j,k,\ell\in\mathbb{Z}\\ j\geq\ell-N_0}}2^j2^{\frac{k}{2}}2^{\frac{\ell}{2}}\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h\Delta_\ell^vY_t\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}\\ &\lesssim\sum_{j,k\in\mathbb{Z}}2^{\frac{3j}{2}}2^{\frac{k}{2}}\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^hY_t\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}\lesssim\|Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}})},\end{aligned}$$

implies (4.1). This finishes the proof of Proposition 4.1. □

4.2. $L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})$ estimate of $\boldsymbol{f}(Y,q)$ given by (2.21).

With (4.1), to derive the $L^1_T(Lip(\mathbb{R}^2))$ estimate of Y_t for smooth enough solutions of (2.20), we need to estimate the $L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})$ norm of $\boldsymbol{f}(Y,q)$ given by (2.21). This will be done in this subsection.

Proposition 4.2. *Let* (Y,q) *be a smooth enough solution of* (2.19) *(or equivalently* (2.20)-(2.21)*) on* $[0,T]$*, with the initial data satisfying* (2.23)*. We assume further that*

$$\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\leq c_0\tag{4.10}$$

for some c_0 *sufficiently small. Then one has*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}\leq&C\Bigl\{\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4}})}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4}})}\\ &+(\|\partial_1Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4}})}+\|\nabla Y^2\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4}})})\|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4}})}\Bigr\}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.11}$$

Proof. Thanks to (2.19), we get by taking ∂_t to $\nabla_Y\cdot Y_t=0$ that

$$\nabla_Y\cdot Y_{tt}=-\partial_t\mathcal{A}_Y^T\nabla\cdot Y_t.\tag{4.12}$$

While for c_0 sufficiently small so that

$$\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(L^\infty)}\leq C\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\leq Cc_0\leq\frac{1}{2},$$

$X(t,y)$ determined by (2.14) has a smooth inverse map $X^{-1}(t,x)$ with $X(t,X^{-1}(t,x))=x$ and $X^{-1}(t,X(t,y))=y$. Then it follows from $\nabla_Y\cdot Y_t=0$ that

$$\nabla_Y\cdot(\nabla_Y\cdot\nabla_YY_t)=[\nabla_x\cdot\Delta_x(Y_t\circ X^{-1}(t,x))]\circ X(t,y)=\nabla_Y\cdot\nabla_Y(\nabla_Y\cdot Y_t)=0,$$

from the latter and (4.12), we obtain by taking $\nabla_Y\cdot$ to the first equation of (2.19) that

$$\nabla_Y\cdot\nabla_Yq=\partial_t\mathcal{A}_Y^T\nabla\cdot Y_t+\nabla_Y\cdot\partial_1^2Y,$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta q =& -(\nabla_Y-\nabla)\cdot\nabla_Y q-\nabla\cdot(\nabla_Y-\nabla)q+\partial_t\mathcal{A}_Y^T\nabla\cdot Y_t+\nabla_Y\cdot\partial_1^2 Y\\ =& -\nabla\cdot\big((\mathcal{A}_Y-I)\mathcal{A}_Y^T\nabla q\big)-\nabla\cdot\big((\mathcal{A}_Y^T-I)\nabla q\big)+\nabla\cdot(\partial_t\mathcal{A}_Y Y_t)+\nabla_Y\cdot\partial_1^2 Y.\end{aligned}\tag{4.13}$$

The above, Lemma 3.1 and Definition 3.2 lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}\leq&\|(\mathcal{A}_Y-I)\mathcal{A}_Y^T\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}+\|(\mathcal{A}_Y^T-I)\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}\\ &+\|\partial_t\mathcal{A}_Y Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}+\|\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}(\nabla_Y\cdot\partial_1^2 Y)\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.14}$$

Applying Lemma 3.3 and (2.16), one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\|(\mathcal{A}_Y^T-I)\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}\lesssim\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12})}\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})},\\ &\|(\mathcal{A}_Y-I)\mathcal{A}_Y^T\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}\lesssim(1+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12})})\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12})}\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}\quad\text{and}\\ &\|\partial_t\mathcal{A}_Y Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}\lesssim\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.15}$$

While by (2.20) and (2.21), we have $\nabla\cdot Y=\rho(Y)=\partial_1 Y^2\partial_2 Y^1-\partial_1 Y^1\partial_2 Y^2$, from which, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_Y\cdot\partial_1^2 Y=&\nabla\cdot\big((\mathcal{A}_Y-I)\partial_1^2 Y\big)+\partial_1^2\rho(Y)\\ =&\partial_1\big(\partial_2 Y^2\partial_1^2 Y^1+\partial_1 Y^2\partial_1\partial_2 Y^1-\partial_1(\partial_1 Y^1\partial_2 Y^2)\big)\\ &+\partial_2(-\partial_1 Y^2\partial_1^2 Y^1+\partial_1 Y^1\partial_1^2 Y^2).\end{aligned}\tag{4.16}$$

Applying Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.3 leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}(\nabla_Y\cdot\partial_1^2 Y)\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}\\ &\qquad\lesssim(\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}+\|\nabla Y^2\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})})\|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.17}$$

Substituting (4.15) and (4.17) into (4.14) and using Lemma 3.2, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}\lesssim&(1+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})})\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}\\ &+\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\\ &+(\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}+\|\nabla Y^2\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})})\|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})},\end{aligned}$$

which together with (4.10) ensures (4.11). This completes the proof of Proposition 4.2. $\square$

We now turn to the estimate of $\boldsymbol{f}(Y,q)$ given by (2.21). The main result is as follows:

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\boldsymbol{f}(Y,q)$ be given by* (2.21). *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.2, and , in addition, if*

$$\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^2_{2,1})}\leq 1,\tag{4.18}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{f}(Y,q)\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}\lesssim&\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12})}+\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\\ &+(\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}+\|\nabla Y^2\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})})\|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\\ &+\big(\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}+\|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\big)\big(\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}+\|\nabla^2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\big)\\ &+\big(\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}+\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^2_{2,1})}\big)\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12})}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.19}$$

Proof. Via (2.21), we split $\boldsymbol{f}(Y,q)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} &\boldsymbol{f}(Y,q) = \bar{\boldsymbol{f}}(Y) + \tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}(Y,q) \quad \text{with} \\ &\bar{\boldsymbol{f}}(Y) \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\nabla_Y \cdot \nabla_Y - \Delta) Y_t, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}(Y,q) \overset{\text{def}}{=} -\nabla_Y q. \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Notice from the definition of $\mathcal{A}_Y = (b_{ij})_{i,j=1,2}$ given by (2.16) that

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{f}}(Y) = \sum_{\ell,m,j=1}^{2} \partial_\ell (b_{\ell j} b_{mj} \partial_m Y_t) - \Delta Y_t \overset{\text{def}}{=} \partial_1 \boldsymbol{F}_1 + \partial_2 \boldsymbol{F}_2, \tag{4.21}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{F}_1 &= (2\partial_2 Y^2 + |\partial_2 Y|^2)\partial_1 Y_t - (1+\partial_2 Y^2)\partial_1 Y^2 \partial_2 Y_t - (1+\partial_1 Y^1)\partial_2 Y^1 \partial_2 Y_t, \\ \boldsymbol{F}_2 &= (2\partial_1 Y^1 + |\partial_1 Y|^2)\partial_2 Y_t - (1+\partial_2 Y^2)\partial_1 Y^2 \partial_1 Y_t - (1+\partial_1 Y^1)\partial_2 Y^1 \partial_1 Y_t, \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

and

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}(Y,q) = -(\mathcal{A}_Y^T - I)\nabla q - \nabla q. \tag{4.23}$$

We first observe from (4.15) and (4.23) that

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}(Y,q)\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})} \lesssim (1 + \|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}) \|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})}. \tag{4.24}$$

To deal with $\bar{\boldsymbol{f}}(Y)$, we need the following two lemmas, their proofs will be presented in the Appendix B.

Lemma 4.1. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.3, one has*

$$\|\partial_2(\partial_2 Y^1 \partial_1 Y_t)\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})} \lesssim \|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} \|Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}})} + \|\partial_1 Y^1\|_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^2_{2,1})} \|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}})}.$$

Lemma 4.2. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.3, one has*

$$\|\partial_1(\partial_2 Y^1 \partial_2 Y_t)\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})} \lesssim \|\partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} \|Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}})}.$$

Now, let us go back to the proof of Proposition 4.3. We first, by applying Lemma 4.1, to get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_2(\partial_2 Y^1 \partial_1 Y_t)\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})} + \|\partial_2(\partial_1 Y^2 \partial_1 Y_t)\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})} \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} \|Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^2_{2,1})} \|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}})}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

By the same argument and using the product laws in Lemma 3.5, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_2(\partial_1 Y^1 \partial_2 Y^1 \partial_1 Y_t)\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})} + \|\partial_2(\partial_2 Y^2 \partial_1 Y^2 \partial_1 Y_t)\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})} \\ &\lesssim \|\partial_1 Y \partial_2 Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} \|Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}})} + \|\partial_1 Y \partial_2 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^2_{2,1})} \|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}})} \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla Y\|^2_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} \|Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}})} + \big(\|\partial_2 Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^2_{2,1})} \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} \\ &\qquad + \|\partial_2 Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^2_{2,1})}\big) \|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}})}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

Whereas applying (3.9) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_2(\partial_1 Y^1 \partial_2 Y_t)\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})} \lesssim & \|\partial_1 Y^1\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4}})} \|\partial_2^2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4}})} \\ & + \|\partial_1 \partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4}})} \|\partial_2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4}})}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

and applying (3.9) twice leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_2(|\partial_1 Y|^2\partial_2 Y_t)\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})} &\lesssim \||\partial_1 Y|^2\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\|\partial_2^2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\\ &\quad + \|\partial_2(|\partial_1 Y|^2)\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\|\partial_2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\\ &\lesssim \|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12})}\big(\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})} + \|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\big)\\ &\qquad \times \big(\|\partial_2^2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})} + \|\partial_2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\big).\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

Combining (4.25)-(4.28) and using Lemma 3.2 and (4.22), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_2 \boldsymbol{F}_2\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})} &\lesssim (1+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})})\big\{\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12})}\\ &\quad + \big(\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})} + \|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\big)\big(\|\partial_2^2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})} + \|\partial_2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\big)\big\}\\ &\quad + \big(1+\|\partial_2 Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})} + \|\partial_2 Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^2_{2,1})}\big)\\ &\qquad \times \big(\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^2_{2,1})}\big)\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12})}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

On the other hand, via (4.22), we deduce from Lemma 4.2 along with its proof that

$$\|\partial_1 \boldsymbol{F}_1\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{0,0})} \lesssim (1+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})})\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12})}. \tag{4.30}$$

Therefore, under the assumptions (4.10) and (4.18), we arrive at (4.19) by summing up (4.11), (4.21), (4.24), (4.29) and (4.30). This concludes the proof of Proposition 4.3. □

4.3. $L^1_T(Lip(\mathbb{R}^2))$ **estimate of** Y_t.

We now conclude this section with

Proposition 4.4. *Under the assumption of Proposition 4.3, one has*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)} \lesssim &\|Y_1\|_{\dot B^0_{2,1}} + \|\partial_1 Y_0\|_{\dot B^0_{2,1}} + \|Y_0\|_{\dot B^2_{2,1}} + \|Y_t\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot B^{\frac12}_{2,1})}\\ &+ \|Y_t\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot B^{\frac52}_{2,1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot B^{\frac12}_{2,1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot B^2_{2,1})} + \|Y^2\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot B^{\frac32}_{2,1})}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

Proof. Thanks to Propositions 4.1 and 4.3, and the assumption (4.10), we infer

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)} &\lesssim \|Y_t\|_{L^1_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12})} \lesssim \|Y_1\|_{\mathcal{B}^{-\frac12,\frac12}} + \|\partial_1 Y_0\|_{\mathcal{B}^{-\frac12,\frac12}} + \|\Delta Y_0\|_{\mathcal{B}^{-\frac12,\frac12}}\\ &\quad + \|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})} + \big(\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^2_{2,1})}\big)\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12})}\\ &\quad + \big(\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})} + \|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\big)\big(\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})} + \|\nabla^2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})}\big)\\ &\quad + (\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})} + \|\nabla Y^2\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})})\|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(\mathcal{B}^{\frac14,\frac14})},\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

which along with Lemma 3.2 and (3.6) lead to (4.31). This completes the proof of Proposition 4.4. □

5. The proof of Theorem 2.2

5.1. *A priori* **estimate of** (2.19).

With $L^1_T(Lip(\mathbb{R}^2))$ estimate of Y_t, we can now proceed with the energy method.

Proposition 5.1. *Let Y be a sufficiently smooth solution of* (2.20) *on* $[0,T]$*. Then one has*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Delta_j Y_t\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}^2+\|\nabla\Delta_j Y_t\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}^2+\|\partial_1\Delta_j Y\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}^2+\|\nabla\Delta_j Y^2\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}^2\\
&\quad+\|\Delta\Delta_j Y\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}^2+\|\nabla\Delta_j Y_t\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}^2+\|\Delta\Delta_j Y_t\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}^2\\
&\quad+\|\partial_1\nabla\Delta_j Y\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}^2+\|\Delta\Delta_j Y^2\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}^2\\
&\lesssim \|\Delta_j Y_1\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla\Delta_j Y_1\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_1\Delta_j Y_0\|_{L^2}^2+\|\Delta\Delta_j Y_0\|_{L^2}^2+\|\Delta_j\rho\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}^2\\
&\quad+\|\nabla\Delta_j\rho\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}^2+\Big|\int_0^T\big(\Delta_j \boldsymbol{f}\mid \Delta_j Y_t-\frac14\Delta\Delta_j Y-\Delta\Delta_j Y_t\big)\,dt\Big|.
\end{aligned}\tag{5.1}$$

Proof. Applying Δ_j to (2.20) gives

$$\Delta_j Y_{tt}-\Delta\Delta_j Y_t-\partial_1^2\Delta_j Y=\Delta_j\boldsymbol{f},\tag{5.2}$$

from which, and along the same line of the proof of (4.5), we get by taking the L^2 inner product of (5.2) with $\Delta_j Y_t-\frac14\Delta\Delta_j Y-\Delta\Delta_j Y_t$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\Big\{\frac12\big(\|\Delta_j Y_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla\Delta_j Y_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_1\Delta_j Y\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_1\nabla\Delta_j Y\|_{L^2}^2+\frac14\|\Delta\Delta_j Y\|_{L^2}^2\big)\\
&\quad-\frac14(\Delta_j Y_t\mid\Delta\Delta_j Y)\Big\}+\frac34\|\nabla\Delta_j Y_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\Delta\Delta_j Y_t\|_{L^2}^2+\frac14\|\partial_1\nabla\Delta_j Y\|_{L^2}^2\\
&=\big(\Delta_j\boldsymbol{f}\mid\Delta_j Y_t-\frac14\Delta\Delta_j Y-\Delta\Delta_j Y_t\big).
\end{aligned}\tag{5.3}$$

While it deduces from $\mathrm{div}Y=\rho(Y)$ the followings

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla\Delta_j Y^2\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}\lesssim\|\partial_1\Delta_j Y\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}+\|\Delta_j\rho\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)},\\
&\|\Delta\Delta_j Y^2\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}\lesssim\|\partial_1\nabla\Delta_j Y\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}+\|\Delta_j\partial_2\rho\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}.
\end{aligned}\tag{5.4}$$

And similar to (4.6), here we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac12\big(\|\Delta_j Y_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla\Delta_j Y_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_1\Delta_j Y\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_1\nabla\Delta_j Y\|_{L^2}^2+\frac14\|\Delta\Delta_j Y\|_{L^2}^2\big)\\
&\quad-\frac14(\Delta_j Y_t\mid\Delta\Delta_j Y)\sim\|\Delta_j Y_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla\Delta_j Y_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_1\Delta_j Y\|_{L^2}^2+\|\Delta\Delta_j Y\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence by integrating (5.3) over $[0,T]$ and using (5.4), we obtain (5.1). This completes the proof of Proposition 5.1. □

The next proposition is concerned with the *a priori* estimate to the pressure function q in (2.19).

Proposition 5.2. *Let (Y,q) be a smooth enough solution of* (2.19) *on* $[0,T]$*. Then under the assumption* (4.10)*, for any $s>-1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\dot H^s)}&\lesssim\|Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}+\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\
&\quad+(\|\nabla Y^2\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}+\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})})\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\
&\quad+(\|Y^2\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+2})}+\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})})\|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(L^2)},
\end{aligned}\tag{5.5}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla q\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)}&\lesssim\|Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\|\nabla q\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}+\|Y_t\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\
&\quad+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}+\|Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}.
\end{aligned}\tag{5.6}$$

Proof. We first deduce from (4.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla q(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s} \leq &\|((\mathcal{A}_Y - I)\mathcal{A}_Y^T\nabla q)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \|((\mathcal{A}_Y^T - I)\nabla q)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}\\ &+ \|(\partial_t\mathcal{A}_Y Y_t)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \|\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}(\nabla_Y\cdot\partial_1^2 Y)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Thanks to (2.16), Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5, we see that for any $s > -1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|((\mathcal{A}_Y - I)\mathcal{A}_Y^T\nabla q)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s} \lesssim &(1 + \|\nabla Y(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}})\big(\|\nabla Y(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}}\|\nabla q(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}\\ &+ \|\nabla Y(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}}\|\nabla q(t)\|_{L^2}\big).\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

By a similar argument, we obtain that for any $s > -1$,

$$\|((\mathcal{A}_Y^T - I)\nabla q)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s} \lesssim \|\nabla Y(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}}\|\nabla q(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \|\nabla Y(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}}\|\nabla q(t)\|_{L^2}, \tag{5.9}$$

and

$$\|(\partial_t\mathcal{A}_Y Y_t)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s} \lesssim \|Y_t(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}}. \tag{5.10}$$

On the other hand, due to (4.16), we deduce from Lemma 3.4 that for any $s > -1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}(\nabla_Y\cdot\partial_1^2 Y)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s} &\lesssim \|(\nabla Y^2\partial_1\nabla Y)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s} + \|(\partial_1 Y\partial_1\nabla Y)(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}\\ &\lesssim \big(\|\nabla Y^2(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}} + \|\partial_1 Y(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}}\big)\|\partial_1\nabla Y(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}\\ &\quad + \big(\|\nabla Y^2(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}} + \|\partial_1 Y(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}}\big)\|\partial_1\nabla Y(t)\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

This combines with (5.7), (5.8), (5.9), (5.10) and the assumption (4.10) ensures that for any $s > -1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla q(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s} \lesssim &\|\nabla Y(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}}\|\nabla q(t)\|_{L^2} + \|Y_t(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}}\\ &+ (\|\nabla Y^2(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}} + \|\partial_1 Y(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}})\|\partial_1\nabla Y(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}\\ &+ (\|\nabla Y^2(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}} + \|\partial_1 Y(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}})\|\partial_1\nabla Y(t)\|_{L^2}, \quad \text{for} \quad t\in(0,T).\end{aligned}$$

Integrating the above inequality over $(0,T)$ leads to (5.5), whereas taking its L^2 norm with respect to time on $(0,T)$ gives rise to (5.6). This proves Proposition 5.2. □

5.2. **The Estimate to the source terms in** (5.1)**.** With Propositions 5.1 and 5.2, to close the *a priori* estimate for smooth enough solutions of (2.20)-(2.21), we need to deal with the estimate of ρ and $\int_0^T\big(\Delta_j\boldsymbol{f} \mid \Delta_j Y_t - \frac{1}{4}\Delta\Delta_j Y - \Delta\Delta_j Y_t\big)\,dt$ for $\rho, \boldsymbol{f}$ given by (2.21). We first present the related estimates for ρ, which is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.4 and (2.21).

Lemma 5.1. *Let Y be a sufficiently smooth function on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^2$. Then for any $s > -1$, $\rho(Y) = \partial_1 Y^2\partial_2 Y^1 - \partial_1 Y^1\partial_2 Y^2$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\Delta_j\rho\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)} \lesssim c_j 2^{-js}\big(\|\partial_2 Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{H}^s)} + \|\partial_2 Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{H}^{s+1})}\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}\big),\\ &\|\nabla\Delta_j\rho\|_{L^2_T(L^2)} \lesssim c_j 2^{-js}\big(\|\partial_2 Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^{s+1})} + \|\partial_2 Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{H}^{s+1})}\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let (Y,q) be a smooth enough solution of (2.20)-(2.21). For $s > -1$, we assume, in addition, that*

$$\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{H}^{s+2})} \leq 1, \tag{5.11}$$

then one has

$$\begin{aligned}|\int_0^T \big(\Delta_j \boldsymbol{f} \mid \Delta_j Y_t\big)\,dt\big| \lesssim c_j^2 2^{-2js}\Big\{&\big(\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\dot H^s)} + \|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}\big)\|Y_t\|_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^s)}\\ &+ \big(\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})} + \|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^1)}\big)\big(\|Y\|^2_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+2})} + \|Y_t\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\big)\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Proof. For $\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}$ given by (4.23), it follows from Lemma 3.4 that

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{f}}\|_{L^1_T(\dot H^s)} \lesssim (1 + \|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})})\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\dot H^s)} + \|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}, \tag{5.13}$$

which along with (5.11) implies for any $s > -1$

$$|\int_0^T \big(\Delta_j \tilde{\boldsymbol{f}} \mid \Delta_j Y_t\big)\,dt\big| \lesssim c_j^2 2^{-2js}\big(\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\dot H^s)} + \|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}\big)\|Y_t\|_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^s)}. \tag{5.14}$$

While via (4.21), we get by using integration by parts that

$$\int_0^T (\Delta_j \bar{\boldsymbol{f}} \mid \Delta_j Y_t)\,dt = -\sum_{i=1}^2 \int_0^T (\Delta_j \boldsymbol{F}_i \mid \Delta_j \partial_i Y_t)_{L^2}\,dt,$$

with $\boldsymbol{F}_1, \boldsymbol{F}_2$ given by (4.22). For any $s > -1$, applying Lemma 3.4, one has

$$\|\partial_2 Y^1 \partial_1 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)} \lesssim \|\partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|\partial_1 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)} + \|\partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\|\partial_1 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}.$$

Applying Lemma 3.4 twice and Lemma 3.5, it leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\partial_2 Y^2 \partial_1 Y^2 \partial_2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)}\\ &\lesssim \|\partial_2 Y^2 \partial_1 Y^2\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|\partial_2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)} + \|\partial_2 Y^2 \partial_1 Y^2\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\|\partial_2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}\\ &\lesssim \|\nabla Y^2\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\big(\|\nabla Y^2\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|\partial_2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)} + \|\nabla Y^2\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\|\partial_2 Y_t\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Similar estimates hold for the other terms in $\boldsymbol{F}_1, \boldsymbol{F}_2$ given by (4.22). Therefore, under the assumption (5.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|\int_0^T (\Delta_j \bar{\boldsymbol{f}} \mid \Delta_j Y_t)\,dt\big| \lesssim c_j^2 2^{-2js}\big\{&\big(\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\ &+ \|Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^1)}\big)\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

This together with (4.20) and (5.14) implies (5.12). We complete the proof of this Lemma. ☐

Lemma 5.3. *Let* (Y, q) *be a smooth enough solution of* (2.20)-(2.21). *For* $s > -1$, *we assume also that* (4.18) *and* (5.11), *then one has*

$$\begin{aligned}|\int_0^T (\Delta_j \boldsymbol{f} \mid \Delta\Delta_j Y_t)\,dt\big| \lesssim c_j^2 2^{-2js}\Big\{&\big(\|\nabla q\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)} + \|\nabla q\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}\big)\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\\ &+ \big(\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})} + \|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\big)\big(\|Y\|^2_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+2})} + \|Y_t\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\big)\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_0^T(\Delta_j\boldsymbol{f}\mid\Delta\Delta_jY)\,dt\Big|\lesssim{}& c_j^2 2^{-2js}\Big\{\big(\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\dot H^s)}+\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}\big)\|Y\|_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\\&+\big(\|\partial_1Y_t^1\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)}+\|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}+\|\partial_1Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\\&+\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\big)\big(\|\partial_1Y\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}+\|Y^2\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+2})}+\|Y\|^2_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\\&+\|\partial_1Y\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}+\|Y_t\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}+\|Y_t\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\big)\Big\}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.16}$$

Proof. Thanks to (4.22) and (4.23), we get by using Lemma 3.4, (4.18) and (5.11) that for any $s>-1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{\boldsymbol f}\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)}\lesssim{}&\sum_{i=1}^2\|\boldsymbol F_i\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\\lesssim{}&\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})},\end{aligned}\tag{5.17}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{\boldsymbol f}\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)}\lesssim{}&(1+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})})\|\nabla q\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)}+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\|\nabla q\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}\\\lesssim{}&\|\nabla q\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)}+\|\nabla q\|_{L^2_T(L^2)},\end{aligned}\tag{5.18}$$

which together with (4.20) implies (5.15).

On the other hand, we infer from (4.18), (5.11), (5.13), (5.17) and (5.18) that for any $s>-1$

$$\Big|\int_0^T(\Delta_j\tilde{\boldsymbol f}\mid\Delta\Delta_jY)\,dt\Big|\lesssim c_j^2 2^{-2js}\big(\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\dot H^s)}+\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(L^2)}\big)\|\Delta Y\|_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^s)},\tag{5.19}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_0^T(\Delta_j\bar f^2\mid\Delta\Delta_jY^2)\,dt\Big|\lesssim{}& c_j^2 2^{-2js}\big(\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\&+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\big)\|\Delta Y^2\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.20}$$

Whereas via (5.17) and using integration by parts, we can obtain for $s>-1$ the following

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_0^T(\Delta_j\partial_1F_1^1\mid\Delta\Delta_jY^1)\,dt\Big|={}&\Big|\int_0^T(\Delta_j\nabla F_1^1\mid\partial_1\nabla\Delta_jY^1)\,dt\Big|\\\lesssim{}&c_j^2 2^{-2js}\big(\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\&+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\big)\|\partial_1\nabla Y^1\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.21}$$

Because of (4.21), (5.19) to (5.21), to complete the proof of (5.16), we only need to deal with the term $\int_0^T(\Delta_j\partial_2F_2^1\mid\Delta\Delta_jY^1)\,dt$. For this purpose, we split F_2^1 as G^1+G^2 with

$$G^1=(2\partial_1Y^1+|\partial_1Y|^2)\partial_2Y_t^1-(1+\partial_2Y^2)\partial_1Y^2\partial_1Y_t^1,\quad G^2=-(1+\partial_1Y^1)\partial_2Y^1\partial_1Y_t^1.\tag{5.22}$$

It follows from Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 and (4.18) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_2G^1\|_{L^1_T(\dot H^s)}\lesssim{}&\|\partial_1Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\&+(\|\partial_1Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}+\|\nabla Y^2\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})})\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})},\end{aligned}$$

for $s>-1$, this along with the fact that $\|\partial_2 G^1\|_{\widetilde{L}^1_T(\dot H^s)} \lesssim \|\partial_2 G^1\|_{L^1_T(\dot H^s)}$ implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\int_0^T (\Delta_j \partial_2 G^1 \mid \Delta\Delta_j Y^1)_{L^2}\,dt\Big| \lesssim c_j^2 2^{-2js}\Big(\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\
&\qquad + (\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})} + \|\nabla Y^2\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})})\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\Big)\|\Delta Y^1\|_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot H^s)},
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.23}
$$

for any $s>-1$.

To handle G^2 in (5.22), we first do a Bony's decomposition (3.7) so that

$$
\partial_2 Y^1 \partial_1 Y^1_t = T_{\partial_2 Y^1}\partial_1 Y^1_t + T_{\partial_1 Y^1_t}\partial_2 Y^1 + R(\partial_2 Y^1, \partial_1 Y^1_t).
$$

Using integration by parts, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T (\Delta_j(T_{\partial_2 Y^1}\partial_1 Y^1_t) \mid \Delta\Delta_j \partial_2 Y^1)\,dt\\
&= -\int_0^T (\Delta_j(T_{\partial_1\partial_2 Y^1} Y^1_t) \mid \Delta\Delta_j \partial_2 Y^1)\,dt - \int_0^T (\Delta_j(T_{\partial_2 Y^1} Y^1_t) \mid \Delta\Delta_j \partial_1\partial_2 Y^1)\,dt,
\end{aligned}
$$

from which and Lemma 3.1, we conclude

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\int_0^T (\Delta_j(T_{\partial_2 Y^1}\partial_1 Y^1_t) \mid \Delta\Delta_j \partial_2 Y^1)\,dt\Big|\\
&\lesssim \sum_{|j'-j|\leq 4} \big(\|S_{j'-1}\partial_1\partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^2_T(L^\infty)}\|\Delta_{j'} Y^1_t\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}\|\Delta\Delta_j \partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}\\
&\qquad + \|S_{j'-1}\partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^\infty_T(L^\infty)}\|\Delta_{j'} Y^1_t\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}\|\Delta\Delta_j \partial_1\partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}\big)\\
&\lesssim c_j^2 2^{-2js}\big(\|\partial_1\partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|Y^1_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\|\Delta Y^1\|_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot H^s)}\\
&\qquad + \|\partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|Y^1_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\|\partial_1 \nabla Y^1\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)}\big).
\end{aligned}
$$

While it is easy to verify that for $s>-1$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\int_0^T (\Delta_j(R(\partial_2 Y^1, \partial_1 Y^1_t)) \mid \Delta\Delta_j \partial_2 Y^1)\,dt\Big|\\
&\lesssim \sum_{j'\geq j-N_0} \|\Delta_{j'}\partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}\|\widetilde{\Delta}_{j'}\partial_1 Y^1_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)}\|\Delta\Delta_j \partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^\infty_T(L^2)}\\
&\lesssim c_j^2 2^{-2js}\|\partial_1 Y^1_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)}\|\partial_2 Y^1\|^2_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}.
\end{aligned}
$$

The same estimate holds for $\int_0^T (\Delta_j(T_{\partial_1 Y^1_t}\partial_2 Y^1)) \mid \Delta\Delta_j \partial_2 Y^1)\,dt$. Consequently we obtain for any $s>-1$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\int_0^T (\Delta_j(\partial_2 Y^1 \partial_1 Y^1_t) \mid \Delta\Delta_j \partial_2 Y^1)_{L^2}\,dt\Big| \lesssim c_j^2 2^{-2js}\Big\{\|\partial_1 Y^1_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)}\|\partial_2 Y^1\|^2_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\
&\qquad + \|\partial_1\partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|Y^1_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\|Y^1\|_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\\
&\qquad + \|\partial_2 Y^1\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|Y^1_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\|\partial_1 Y^1\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\Big\}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.24}
$$

Finally, under the assumption (5.11), we deduce from Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 the following

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\int_0^T (\Delta_j(\partial_1 Y^1\partial_2 Y^1\partial_1 Y^1_t)\mid \Delta\Delta_j\partial_2 Y^1)\,dt\Big|\\
&\quad\lesssim c_j^2 2^{-2js}\Big(\|\partial_1 Y^1\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\|\partial_1 Y^1_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}+(\|\partial_1 Y^1\|_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\
&\qquad\qquad+\|\partial_1 Y^1\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})})\|\partial_1 Y^1_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\Big)\|\partial_2 Y^1\|_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\quad \text{for}\quad s>-1,
\end{aligned}$$

from which and (5.22), (5.24), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|\int_0^T (\Delta_j\partial_2 G^2\mid \Delta\Delta_j Y^1)\,dt\Big| &\lesssim c_j^2 2^{-2js}\big(\|\partial_1 Y^1_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)}+\|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\\
&\quad+\|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}+\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}+\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\big)\big(\|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}\\
&\quad+\|Y\|^2_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+2})}+\|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}+\|Y_t\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}+\|Y_t\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+2})}\big),
\end{aligned}\tag{5.25}$$

for any $s>-1$ and with the assumption (5.11).

Using (4.21), and by summing up (5.19), (5.20), (5.21), (5.23) and (5.25), we conclude the proof of (5.16). This finishes the proof of Lemma 5.3. □

5.3. **The proof of Theorem 2.2.** The proof of Theorem 2.2 is based on the following proposition:

Proposition 5.3. *Let* $s_1>1$ *and* $s_2\in(-1,-\frac12)$. *Let* (Y,q) *be a smooth enough solution of* (2.20)-(2.21) *on* $[0,T]$. *We denote* $\mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_T(Y,q)$ *as*

$$\mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_T(Y,q)\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}E^{s_1}_T(Y,q)+E^{s_2}_T(Y,q)\quad\textit{and}\quad \mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_0\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}E^{s_1}_0+E^{s_2}_0,\tag{5.26}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
E^s_T(Y,q)\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}&\|Y_t\|^2_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^s)}+\|Y_t\|^2_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}+\|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^s)}+\|Y^2\|^2_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\
&+\|Y\|^2_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s+2})}+\|Y_t\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}+\|Y_t\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+2})}+\|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+1})}\\
&+\|Y^2\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^{s+2})}+\|\nabla q\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot H^s)}+\|\nabla q\|^2_{L^1_T(\dot H^s)},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$E^s_0\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}\|Y_1\|^2_{\dot H^s}+\|Y_1\|^2_{\dot H^{s+1}}+\|\partial_1 Y_0\|^2_{\dot H^s}+\|Y_0\|^2_{\dot H^{s+2}}.$$

Then under the assumption (4.10) *and*

$$\|\nabla Y\|_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot B^1_{2,1})}+\|\nabla Y\|_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot B^2_{2,1})}+\|Y\|_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s_1+2})}+\|Y\|_{\widetilde L^\infty_T(\dot H^{s_2+2})}\le 1,\tag{5.27}$$

we have

$$\mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_T(Y,q)\le C_1\mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_0+C_1\big((\mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_0)^{1/2}+\mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_T(Y,q)^{1/2}+\mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_T(Y,q)\big)\mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_T(Y,q),\tag{5.28}$$

for some positive constant C_1.

Proof. Under the assumptions (4.10) and (5.27), for $s = s_1$ and $s = s_2$, we can deduce from Propositions 5.1 and 5.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
E^s_T(Y,q) \lesssim E^s_0 &+ \|\rho\|^2_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot{H}^s)} + \|\rho\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^{s+1})} + \|Y\|^2_{L^\infty_T(\dot{H}^{s+2})}\big(\|\nabla q\|^2_{L^1_T(L^2)} + \|\nabla q\|^2_{L^2_T(L^2)}\big)\\
&+ \big(\|Y_t\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|\nabla Y^2\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|\partial_1\nabla Y\|^2_{L^2_T(L^2)} + \|Y_t\|^2_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\\
&+ \|\nabla Y\|^2_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\big)E^s_T(Y,q) + \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{2js}\Big|\int_0^T \big(\Delta_j \boldsymbol{f} \mid \Delta_j Y_t - \frac{1}{4}\Delta\Delta_j Y - \Delta\Delta_j Y_t\big)\,dt\Big|.
\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Lemma 5.1, there holds

$$\|\rho\|^2_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot{H}^s)} + \|\rho\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^{s+1})} \lesssim \big(\|\nabla Y\|^2_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{L^\infty_T(L^2)} + \|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\big)E^s_T(Y,q).$$

While it follows from Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} 2^{2js}\Big|\int_0^T \big(\Delta_j \boldsymbol{f} \mid \Delta_j Y_t - \frac{1}{4}\Delta\Delta_j Y - \Delta\Delta_j Y_t\big)\,dt\Big|\\
&\lesssim \big(\|Y\|_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot{H}^{s+2})} + \|Y_t\|_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot{H}^s)} + \|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^{s+2})}\big)\big(\|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(\dot{H}^s)} + \|\nabla q\|_{L^1_T(L^2)} + \|\nabla q\|_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^s)}\\
&\quad + \|\nabla q\|_{L^2_T(L^2)}\big) + \big(\|\partial_1 Y^1_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)} + \|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\\
&\quad + \|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^1)} + \|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\big)\big(\|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + E^s_T(Y,q)\big) \quad \text{for} \quad s = s_1, s_2.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, we obtain for $s = s_1, s_2$, that

$$\begin{aligned}
E^s_T(Y,q) \lesssim E^s_0 &+ \big((E^0_T(Y,q))^{1/2} + (E^s_T(Y,q))^{1/2} + E^0_T(Y,q) + E^s_T(Y,q)\\
&+ \|\partial_1 Y^1_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)} + \|\nabla Y\|_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|_{\widetilde{L}^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{\widetilde{L}^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\\
&+ \|\nabla Y_t\|_{\widetilde{L}^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|\nabla Y^2\|^2_{\widetilde{L}^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{\widetilde{L}^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|Y_t\|^2_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\\
&+ \|Y_t\|^2_{\widetilde{L}^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\big)\big(E^0_T(Y,q) + E^s_T(Y,q) + \|\partial_1 Y\|^2_{\widetilde{L}^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})}\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

Notice from (3.5), one can easily deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\partial_1 Y\|_{\widetilde{L}^2_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} \lesssim \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^{s_2+1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^{s_1+1})},\\
&\text{and} \quad E^0_T(Y,q) \lesssim E^{s_2}_T(Y,q) + E^{s_1}_T(Y,q),
\end{aligned}$$

for any $s_1 > 1$, $s_2 \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$. Thus by taking $s = s_1, s_2$ in (5.29) and summing up the resulting inequality yields

$$\mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_T(Y,q) \lesssim \mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_0 + \big(\|\partial_1 Y^1_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)} + \mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_T(Y,q)^{1/2} + \mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_T(Y,q)\big)\mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_T(Y,q). \tag{5.30}$$

On the other hand, it follows from Proposition 4.4 and (3.5) that

$$\|\partial_1 Y^1_t\|_{L^1_T(L^\infty)} \lesssim (\mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_0)^{1/2} + \mathcal{E}^{s_1,s_2}_T(Y,q). \tag{5.31}$$

Substituting (5.31) into (5.30), one concludes the proof of (5.28). □

Remark 5.1. *We should mention that the restriction for $s_2 \in (-1, -\frac{1}{2})$ in Theorem 2.2 is due to the following fact:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{2,1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{B}^{\frac{1}{2}}_{2,1})} \lesssim &\|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^{s_2+1})} + \|Y_t\|_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^{s_1+1})}\\
&+ \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^{s_2+1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2_T(\dot{H}^{s_1+1})},
\end{aligned}$$

which has been used in the proof of (5.31).

Now we are in position to complete the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Given initial data (Y_0, Y_1) satisfying the assumptions listed in Theorem 2.2, we deduce by a standard argument that (2.20)-(2.21) has a unique solution (Y, q) on $[0, T]$, which satisfies (2.25) on $[0, T]$. Let T^* be the largest possible time so that (2.25) holds. Then to completes the proof of Theorem 2.2, we only need to show that $T^* = \infty$ and there holds (2.26) provided that (2.23) and (2.24) hold. Toward this, we denote

$$\bar{T} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \max\{\ T < T^* :\quad \mathcal{E}_T^{s_1,s_2}(Y, q) \leq \eta_0^2 \quad \}, \tag{5.32}$$

for η_0 so small that $C_1(\eta_0 + 2\eta_0^2) \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla Y\|_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot{B}^1_{2,1})} + \|\nabla Y\|_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot{B}^2_{2,1})} + \|Y\|_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot{H}^{s_1+2})} + \|Y\|_{\widetilde{L}^\infty_T(\dot{H}^{s_2+2})} \\ &\leq C_2 \mathcal{E}_T^{s_1,s_2}(Y, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_2 \eta_0 \leq 1, \end{aligned} \tag{5.33}$$

for the same C_1 as that in (5.28).

We shall prove that $\bar{T} = \infty$ provided that ε_0 is sufficiently small in (2.24). Otherwise, by (5.33), we can apply Proposition 5.3 to conclude that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\bar{T}}^{s_1,s_2}(Y, q) \leq 4C_1 \mathcal{E}_0^{s_1,s_2}. \tag{5.34}$$

In particular, if we take ε_0 so small that $4C_1\varepsilon_0^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\eta_0^2$, (5.34) contradicts with (5.32) if $\bar{T} < \infty$. This in turn shows that $\bar{T} = T^* = \infty$, and (2.26) is valid. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2. □

6. The proof of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 1.1

With Theorem 2.2 and Lemma A.1 in the Appendix A in hand, we can now present the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Given $\psi_0, \tilde{\psi}_0$ satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, we get by using Lemma 2.1 that there exists a vector-valued function $Y_0(y) = (Y_0^1(y), Y_0^2(y))$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|Y_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+2}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2+2}} + \|\partial_1 Y_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_2}} \\ &\leq C(\|\nabla\psi_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2}}, \|\nabla\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2+1}})\big(\|\nabla\psi_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2}} + \|\nabla\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2+1}}\big), \end{aligned}$$

and $X_0(y) \overset{\text{def}}{=} I + Y_0(y)$ satisfies

$$\nabla_y Y_0(y) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_2}\psi_0 & \partial_{x_2}\tilde{\psi}_0 \\ -\partial_{x_1}\psi_0 & -\partial_{x_1}\tilde{\psi}_0 \end{pmatrix} \circ X_0(y).$$

Let $Y_1(y) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \boldsymbol{u}_0(X_0(y))$. Applying Lemma A.1 (vi) and (ii) with $\Phi = X_0^{-1}(x)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\|Y_1\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}} \leq C(\|\nabla_x\Psi_0\|_{L^\infty})(1 + \|\Delta_x\Psi_0\|_{H^{s_1-1}})\|\nabla_x\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{H^{s_1}}, \\ &\|Y_1\|_{\dot{H}^{s_2}} \leq C(\|\nabla_x\Psi_0\|_{L^\infty})\big(\|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_2}} + \|\nabla_x\Psi_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_2+1}}\|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{L^2}\big), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Psi_0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\psi_0, \tilde{\psi}_0)^T$. Therefore, thanks to (2.5), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|Y_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+2}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2+2}} + \|\partial_1 Y_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_2}} + \|Y_1\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2}} \\ &\qquad \lesssim \|\nabla\psi_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2}} + \|\nabla\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2+1}} + \|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+1}\cap\dot{H}^{s_2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

from which, (2.5) and Theorem 2.2, we deduce that the system (2.19) has a unique global solution (Y, q) which satisfies (2.25) and (2.26) provided that c_0 in (2.5) is sufficiently small.

Let $X(t,y) \overset{\text{def}}{=} y + Y(t,y)$, it follows from (2.26) that $X(t,y)$ is invertible with respect to y variable and we denote its inverse mapping by $X^{-1}(t,x)$. Let

$$(a_{ij}(t,y))_{i,j=1,2} \overset{\text{def}}{=} I + \nabla_y Y(t,y) \quad \text{and} \quad (b_{ij}(t,y))_{i,j=1,2} \overset{\text{def}}{=} (a_{ij}(t,y))^{-1}_{i,j=1,2}.$$

Then as $\det(I + \nabla_y Y) = 1$, $(b_{ij})_{i,j=1,2}$ equals to the adjoint matrix of $(a_{ij})_{i,j=1,2}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^2 \partial_i b_{ij} = 0$. With the notations above, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_{x_2}\big(-\partial_1 Y^2(t, X^{-1}(t,x))\big) - \partial_{x_1}\big(\partial_1 Y^1(t, X^{-1}(t,x))\big)\\
&= -\partial_{x_2}\big(a_{21}(t, X^{-1}(t,x))\big) - \partial_{x_1}\big(a_{11}(t, X^{-1}(t,x))\big)\\
&= -\sum_{j=1}^2 \big[\partial_j(b_{j2}a_{21} + b_{j1}a_{11})(t, X^{-1}(t,x))\big] = \sum_{j=1}^2 [\partial_j \delta_{j1}](t, X^{-1}(t,x)) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

By a similar argument, we have

$$\partial_{x_2}\big(-\partial_2 Y^2(t, X^{-1}(t,x))\big) - \partial_{x_1}\big(\partial_2 Y^1(t, X^{-1}(t,x))\big) = 0,$$

so that we can define $(\psi(t,x), \tilde{\psi}(t,x))$ through

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla_x \psi(t,x) = \big(-\partial_1 Y^2(t, X^{-1}(t,x)), \partial_1 Y^1(t, X^{-1}(t,x))\big)^T, \quad \psi(t,x) \to 0 \text{ as } |x| \to \infty,\\
&\nabla_x \tilde{\psi}(t,x) = \big(-\partial_2 Y^2(t, X^{-1}(t,x)), \partial_2 Y^1(t, X^{-1}(t,x))\big)^T, \quad \tilde{\psi}(t,x) \to 0 \text{ as } |x| \to \infty,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

and we define $(\boldsymbol{u}(t,x), p(t,x))$ via

$$\boldsymbol{u}(t,x) \overset{\text{def}}{=} Y_t(t, X^{-1}(t,x)), \quad p(t,x) \overset{\text{def}}{=} q(t, X^{-1}(t,x)) - |\nabla_x(x_2 + \psi(t,x))|^2. \tag{6.3}$$

Then according to Section 2, $(\phi, \tilde{\phi}, \boldsymbol{u}, p) = (x_2 + \psi, -x_1 + \tilde{\psi}, \boldsymbol{u}, p)$ thus defined satisfies (2.4) and globally solves the coupled system between (1.1) and (2.1). Then to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1, it suffices to prove (2.6).

For this, we first notice from (6.3) that

$$(\nabla \boldsymbol{u}) \circ X(t,y) = \nabla_y Y_t(t,y)\big(I + \nabla_y Y(t,y)\big)^{-1},$$

which leads to

$$\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^+;L^\infty)} \lesssim (1 + \|\nabla_y Y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^\infty)})\|\nabla_y Y_t\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^+;L^\infty)}. \tag{6.4}$$

Again thanks to (6.3) and (6.2), we get by applying Lemma A.1 (ii) with $\Phi = X(t,y)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_2})} + \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_2})}\\
&\quad \le C(\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^\infty)})\big\{\|Y_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_2})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_2})}\\
&\qquad + \|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_2+1})}\big(\|Y_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)} + \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2)}\big)\big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

Whereas applying Lemma A.1 (iii) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_2+1})} + \|\nabla \tilde{\psi}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_2+1})} + \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_2+1})}\\
&\le C(\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^\infty)})\big(\|Y_t\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_2+1})} + \|\partial_2 Y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_2+1})} + \|\partial_1 Y\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot{H}^{s_2+1})}\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

In the same manner, we get by applying Lemma A.1 (vi) to (6.3) and (6.2) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s_1+1})}+\|\nabla\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s_1+1})}+\|\nabla\tilde\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s_1+1})}\\&\quad+\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s_1+2})}+\|\nabla\psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s_1+1})}\\&\le C(\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^\infty)})(1+\|\Delta Y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;H^{s_1})})\big(\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;H^{s_1})}\\&\quad+\|\Delta Y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;H^{s_1})}+\|\nabla Y_t\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;H^{s_1+1})}+\|\partial_1\nabla Y\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;H^{s_1})}\big).\end{aligned}\tag{6.7}$$

Consequently, we deduce from (2.26), (3.5), (6.1), and (6.4) to (6.7) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2})}+\|\nabla\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2})}+\|\nabla\tilde\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2+1})}\\&\quad+\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s_1+2}\cap\dot H^{s_2+1})}+\|\nabla\psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2+1})}+\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^+;L^\infty)}\\&\lesssim\|\nabla\psi_0\|_{\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2}}+\|\nabla\tilde\psi_0\|_{\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2+1}}+\|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2}},\end{aligned}\tag{6.8}$$

provided that (2.5) holds for c_0 sufficiently small.

Next, it follows from (6.3) that

$$\nabla_x p=((I+\nabla Y)^{-T}\nabla q)\circ X^{-1}-2\nabla_x\partial_{x_2}\psi-\nabla_x(|\nabla_x\psi|^2).$$

Applying Lemma A.1 (ii) and Lemma 3.4 gives rise to

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_x p(t)\|_{\dot H^{s_2}}\le&C(\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^\infty)})\big\{\|((I+\nabla Y)^{-T}\nabla q))(t)\|_{\dot H^{s_2}}+\|\nabla Y(t)\|_{\dot H^{s_2+1}}\\&\times\|((I+\nabla Y)^{-T}\nabla q))(t)\|_{L^2}+\|\nabla\psi(t)\|_{\dot H^{s_2+1}}+\|(\nabla\psi)^2(t)\|_{\dot H^{s_2+1}}\big\}\\\le&C(\|\nabla Y\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^\infty)})\big\{(1+\|\nabla Y(t)\|_{\dot B^1_{2,1}})\big(\|\nabla q(t)\|_{\dot H^{s_2}}\\&+\|\nabla Y(t)\|_{\dot H^{s_2+1}}\|\nabla q(t)\|_{L^2}\big)+(1+\|\nabla\psi(t)\|_{\dot B^1_{2,1}})\|\nabla\psi(t)\|_{\dot H^{s_2+1}}\big\},\end{aligned}$$

which along with (2.26), (3.5), (6.1) and (6.8) implies that

$$\|\nabla_x p\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s_2})}\lesssim\|\nabla\psi_0\|_{\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2}}+\|\nabla\tilde\psi_0\|_{\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2+1}}+\|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2}},$$

provided that (2.5) holds for c_0 sufficiently small.

Finally, applying Lemma A.1 (v) and (iv), along with (2.26), (3.5), (6.1), (6.8) and Lemma 3.4 yields

$$\|\nabla_x p\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+;\dot H^{s_1})}\lesssim\|\nabla\psi_0\|_{\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2}}+\|\nabla\tilde\psi_0\|_{\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2+1}}+\|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{\dot H^{s_1+1}\cap\dot H^{s_2}}.$$

This completes the proof of (2.6) and thus Theorem 2.1. □

Before we present the proof of Theorem 1.1, we shall first prove the following blow-up criterion for smooth enough solutions of (1.6).

Proposition 6.1. *Given $\psi_0\in H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_0\in H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for $s>1$, (1.6) has a unique solution $(\psi,\boldsymbol{u})$ on $[0,T]$ for some $T>0$ so that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\psi\in C([0,T];H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^2)),\quad\boldsymbol{u}\in C([0,T];H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)),\quad\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\in L^2((0,T);H^s(\mathbb{R}^2)),\\&\nabla p\in L^2((0,T);H^{s-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)).\end{aligned}\tag{6.9}$$

Moreover, if T^* is the lifespan to this solution and $T^*<\infty$, then

$$\int_0^{T^*}\big(\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty}+\|\nabla\psi(t)\|^2_{L^\infty}\big)\,dt=\infty.\tag{6.10}$$

Proof. Given initial data $(\psi_0, \boldsymbol{u}_0)$, it is standard to prove that (1.6) has a unique solution $(\psi, \boldsymbol{u})$ on $[0,T]$ for some $T > 0$, so that there holds the first line of (6.9). While we get by taking div to the momentum equation of (1.6) that

$$\nabla p = -2\nabla\partial_2\psi + \nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}\operatorname{div}\bigl\{\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{u} + \operatorname{div}(\nabla\psi\otimes\nabla\psi)\bigr\},$$

which along with the first line of (6.9) implies that $\nabla p \in L^2((0,T); H^{s-1}(\mathbb{R}^2))$. This proves (6.9).

It remains to verify the blow-up criterion (6.10). Toward this, for any $t < T^*$, we get by using a standard energy estimate for (1.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\bigl(\|\psi(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2\bigr) + 2\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\quad = -(u^2 \mid \psi) - (\Delta\psi \mid u^2) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\nabla\psi\otimes\nabla\psi : \nabla\boldsymbol{u}\,dx\\
&\quad \leq \frac{1}{2}\bigl(\|\psi(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|u^2(t)\|_{L^2}^2\bigr) + \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla\psi(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2\|\nabla\psi(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality, one has, for any $t < T^*$

$$\|\psi(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2_t(L^2)}^2 \leq \bigl(\|\psi_0\|_{H^1}^2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{L^2}^2\bigr)\exp\bigl\{t + \|\nabla\psi\|_{L^2_t(L^\infty)}^2\bigr\}. \tag{6.11}$$

While acting Δ_j to u^1 equation of (1.6) and then taking the L^2 inner product of the resulting equation with $\Delta_j u^1$, it leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\Delta_j u^1(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\Delta_j u^1\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\quad = -\bigl(\Delta_j\partial_1(p + \partial_2\psi) \mid \Delta_j u^1\bigr) - \bigl(\Delta_j(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla u^1) \mid \Delta_j u^1\bigr) - \bigl(\operatorname{div}\Delta_j(\partial_1\psi\nabla\psi) \mid \Delta_j u^1\bigr).
\end{aligned}\tag{6.12}$$

Similarly acting Δ_j to u^2 equation of (1.6) and then taking the L^2 inner product of the resulting equation with $\Delta_j u^2$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\Delta_j u^2(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\Delta_j u^2\|_{L^2}^2 + (\Delta_j\Delta\psi \mid \Delta_j u^2)\\
&\quad = -\bigl(\Delta_j\partial_2(p + \partial_2\psi) \mid \Delta_j u^2\bigr) - \bigl(\Delta_j(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla u^2) \mid \Delta_j u^2\bigr) - \bigl(\operatorname{div}\Delta_j(\partial_2\psi\nabla\psi) \mid \Delta_j u^2\bigr).
\end{aligned}\tag{6.13}$$

However by the transport equation of (1.6) and using integration by parts, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Delta_j\Delta\psi \mid \Delta_j u^2) &= -\bigl(\Delta_j\Delta\psi \mid \Delta_j(\partial_t\psi + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\psi)\bigr)\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\nabla\Delta_j\psi(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \bigl(\Delta_j\nabla\psi \mid \nabla\Delta_j(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\psi)\bigr).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence by combining (6.12) with (6.13) and using $\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{u} = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\bigl(\|\Delta_j\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\Delta_j\psi(t)\|_{L^2}^2\bigr) + \|\nabla\Delta_j\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\quad = -\bigl(\Delta_j(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{u}) \mid \Delta_j\boldsymbol{u}\bigr) - \bigl(\Delta_j\nabla\psi \mid \nabla\Delta_j(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\psi)\bigr) - \bigl(\operatorname{div}\Delta_j(\nabla\psi\otimes\nabla\psi) \mid \Delta_j\boldsymbol{u}\bigr).
\end{aligned}\tag{6.14}$$

Next for $s > 0$, we claim that

$$\begin{aligned}
\bigl|\bigl(\Delta_j(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla b) \mid \Delta_j b\bigr)\bigr| &\lesssim c_j(t)^2 2^{-2js}\bigl(\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty}\|b(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2\\
&\qquad + \|\nabla b(t)\|_{L^\infty}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}\|b(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}\bigr) \quad \text{or}\\
\bigl|\bigl(\Delta_j(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla b) \mid \Delta_j b\bigr)\bigr| &\lesssim c_j(t)^2 2^{-2js}\bigl(\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty}\|b(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2\\
&\qquad + \|b(t)\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}\|b(t)\|_{\dot{H}^s}\bigr).
\end{aligned}\tag{6.15}$$

Indeed applying Bony's decomposition (3.7) for $\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla b$ and then using a standard commutator's argument, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\Delta_j(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla b)\mid\Delta_j b\big)=&\sum_{|j-\ell|\leq 5}\big([\Delta_j;S_{\ell-1}\boldsymbol{u}]\cdot\nabla\Delta_\ell b+(S_{\ell-1}\boldsymbol{u}-S_{j-1}\boldsymbol{u})\cdot\nabla\Delta_\ell\Delta_j b\mid\Delta_j b\big)\\&+\big(S_{j-1}\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\Delta_j b\mid\Delta_j b\big)-\big(\Delta_j(\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{u},\nabla b))\mid\Delta_j b\big).\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the classical commutator's estimate (see [1] for instance) that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{|j-\ell|\leq 5}\big|\big([\Delta_j;S_{\ell-1}\boldsymbol{u}]\cdot\nabla\Delta_\ell b\mid\Delta_j b\big)\big|\lesssim&\sum_{|j-\ell|\leq 5}\|\nabla S_{\ell-1}\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty}\|\Delta_\ell b\|_{L^2}\|\Delta_j b\|_{L^2}\\\lesssim& c_j(t)^2 2^{-2js}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty}\|b(t)\|_{\dot H^s}^2.\end{aligned}$$

The same estimate holds for $\sum_{|j-\ell|\leq 5}\big((S_{\ell-1}\boldsymbol{u}-S_{j-1}\boldsymbol{u})\cdot\nabla\Delta_\ell\Delta_j b\mid\Delta_j b\big)$ and $\big(S_{j-1}\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla\Delta_j b\mid\Delta_j b\big)$.

Whereas applying Lemma 3.1 gives

$$\|\Delta_j\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{u},\nabla b)\|_{L^2}\lesssim\sum_{\ell\geq j-N_0}\|\Delta_\ell\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2}\|S_{\ell+2}\nabla b\|_{L^\infty},$$

which can be controlled by $c_j(t)2^{-js}\|\nabla b(t)\|_{L^\infty}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{\dot H^s}$ or $c_j(t)2^{-js}\|b(t)\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{\dot H^s}$ as long as $s>0$. This completes the proof of (6.15).

Now we go back to (6.14). In fact, applying Lemma 3.4 (i) and (6.15) to (6.14) gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\big(\|\Delta_j\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla\Delta_j\psi(t)\|_{L^2}^2\big)+\|\nabla\Delta_j\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2}^2\\&\lesssim c_j(t)^2 2^{-2js}\big\{\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty}(\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\dot H^s}^2+\|\nabla\psi\|_{\dot H^s}^2)+\|\nabla\psi\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\dot H^s}\|\nabla\psi\|_{\dot H^s}\big\}\quad\text{for } s>0.\end{aligned}$$

The above implies for any $s>0$

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{\dot H^s}^2+\|\nabla\psi(t)\|_{\dot H^s}^2+\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2_t(\dot H^s)}^2\\&\leq\|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{\dot H^s}^2+\|\nabla\psi_0\|_{\dot H^s}^2+C\int_0^t(\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}(t')\|_{L^\infty}+\|\nabla\psi(t')\|_{L^\infty}^2)(\|\boldsymbol{u}(t')\|_{\dot H^s}^2+\|\nabla\psi(t')\|_{\dot H^s}^2)\,dt'.\end{aligned}$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{\dot H^s}^2+\|\nabla\psi(t)\|_{\dot H^s}^2+\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2_t(\dot H^s)}^2\\&\leq(\|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{\dot H^s}^2+\|\nabla\psi_0\|_{\dot H^s}^2)\exp\Big\{C\int_0^t(\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}(t')\|_{L^\infty}+\|\nabla\psi(t')\|_{L^\infty}^2)\,dt'\Big\}\quad\text{for}\quad t<T^*,\end{aligned}$$

which together with (6.11) implies (6.10). This completes the proof of Proposition 6.1. □

To apply Theorem 2.2 to prove Theorem 1.1, we also need the following lemma concerning the existence of $\tilde\psi_0$ for given $\psi_0\in\mathcal{A}_{k+1,s}(\mathbb{R}^2)$:

Lemma 6.1. *Let $k\geq 2$ be an integer and $s>\frac{3}{2}$. Let $\psi_0\in\mathcal{A}_{k+1,s}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{k,s}}\leq 1$ and $\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{3,s}}\leq\varepsilon$ for some ε sufficiently small. Then there exists a unique $\tilde\psi_0\in H^k(\mathbb{R}^2)$ so that there holds* (2.2) *and $\tilde\psi_0(0,x_2)=0$. Furthermore, one has*

$$\|\tilde\psi_0\|_{H^k}\leq C_{k,s}\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{k+1,s}}.\tag{6.16}$$

The proof of Lemma 6.1 will be presented in the Appendix C. We now turn to the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Thanks to Proposition 6.1, given initial data $(\psi_0, \boldsymbol{u}_0)$ satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, (1.6) has a unique solution $(\psi, \boldsymbol{u}, p)$ on $[0,T]$ so that there holds (1.9). To prove that the lifespan to this solution equals ∞, we only need to show that

$$\int_0^T \big(\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla\psi(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2\big)\,dt < \infty \quad \text{for any} \quad T<\infty. \tag{6.17}$$

For this purpose, we observe that for given $\psi_0 \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1,s}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $k\geq 2$ and $s>\frac{3}{2}$, we deduce from Lemma 6.1 that there exists a unique $\tilde{\psi}_0 \in H^k(\mathbb{R}^2)$ so that there hold (2.2) and (6.16). This together with (1.10) implies that

$$\|\nabla\psi_0\|_{\dot H^{k-1}\cap \dot H^{s_2}} + \|\nabla\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{\dot H^{k-1}\cap\dot H^{s_2+1}} + \|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{\dot H^{k-1}\cap\dot H^{s_2}} \leq Cc_0$$

for the same c_0 as that in (1.10). Then as long as c_0 is sufficiently small in (1.10), we deduce from Theorem 2.1 that the coupled system between (1.1) and (2.1) has a unique solution $(\phi, \tilde{\phi}, \boldsymbol{u}, \mathfrak{p}) = (x_2+\Psi, -x_1+\tilde{\Psi}, \boldsymbol{u}, \mathfrak{p})$ with $(\Psi, \tilde{\Psi}, \boldsymbol{u}, \mathfrak{p})$ satisfying (2.4) and (2.6) for $s_1 = k-2$, $k\geq 3$. In particular, $(\phi, \boldsymbol{u}, \mathfrak{p}) = (x_2+\Psi, \boldsymbol{u}, \mathfrak{p})$ thus obtained solves (1.1) and $(\Psi, \boldsymbol{u}, \mathfrak{p})$ satisfies (1.11). Then $(\Psi, \boldsymbol{u}, \mathfrak{p})$ solves (1.6), due to the uniqueness of solutions to (1.6), we have $(\Psi, \boldsymbol{u}, \mathfrak{p}) = (\psi, \boldsymbol{u}, p)$ obtained above (6.17). Hence it follows from (1.11) that (6.17) holds for any fixed $T<\infty$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. $\square$

Appendix A. The Sobolev estimates to a function composed with a measure preservation mapping

Lemma A.1. *Let $\Phi(y) = y + \Psi(y)$ be a diffeomorphism from $\mathbb{R}^2$ to $\mathbb{R}^2$ with* $\det(\nabla_y\Phi) = \det(I+\nabla_y\Psi) = 1$, *and $\Phi^{-1}(x)$ be its inverse mapping. Then for any smooth function u, v, there hold*
(i) if $s=0$,

$$\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^0} = \|u\|_{\dot H^0} \quad \textit{and} \quad \|v\circ\Phi^{-1}\|_{\dot H^0} = \|v\|_{\dot H^0};$$

(ii) if $-1<s<0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^s} \lesssim (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{s+3}\|u\|_{\dot H^s} + (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{\dot H^{s+1}}\|u\|_{L^2} \quad \textit{and}\\ &\|v\circ\Phi^{-1}\|_{\dot H^s} \lesssim (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{s+3}\|v\|_{\dot H^s} + (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{\dot H^{s+1}}\|v\|_{L^2};\end{aligned}$$

(iii) if $0<s<1$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^s} \lesssim (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{s+1}\|u\|_{\dot H^s} \quad \textit{and}\\ &\|v\circ\Phi^{-1}\|_{\dot H^s} \lesssim (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{s+1}\|v\|_{\dot H^s};\end{aligned}$$

(iv) if $s=1$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^1} \lesssim (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})\|u\|_{\dot H^1} \quad \textit{and}\\ &\|v\circ\Phi^{-1}\|_{\dot H^1} \lesssim (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})\|v\|_{\dot H^1};\end{aligned}$$

(v) if $1<s\leq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^s} \lesssim (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{s+1}\|u\|_{\dot H^s} + \|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{\dot H^s}\|\nabla_x u\|_{L^2} \quad \textit{and}\\ &\|v\circ\Phi^{-1}\|_{\dot H^s} \lesssim (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{s+1}\|v\|_{\dot H^s} + \|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{\dot H^s}\|\nabla_y v\|_{L^2};\end{aligned}$$

(vi) if $s>2$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^s} \lesssim (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{s+1}(1+\|\Delta_y\Psi\|_{H^{s-2}})\|\nabla_x u\|_{H^{s-1}} \quad \textit{and}\\ &\|v\circ\Phi^{-1}\|_{\dot H^s} \lesssim (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{s+1}(1+\|\Delta_y\Psi\|_{H^{s-2}})\|\nabla_y v\|_{H^{s-1}},\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We denote

$$\mathcal{A}=(a_{ij})_{i,j=1,2}\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}I+\nabla_y\Psi,\quad \mathcal{B}=(b_{ij})_{i,j=1,2}\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}(I+\nabla_y\Psi)^{-1}.$$

Due to $\det\mathcal{A}=1$, the matrix $\mathcal{B}$ equals to the adjoint matrix of $\mathcal{A}$. This leads to

$$(\partial_{x_i}u)\circ\Phi=\sum_{j=1}^{2}b_{ji}\partial_{y_j}(u\circ\Phi)\quad\text{and}\quad(\partial_{y_i}v)\circ\Phi^{-1}=\sum_{j=1}^{2}a_{ji}\circ\Phi^{-1}\partial_{x_j}(v\circ\Phi^{-1}).\tag{A.1}$$

In what follows, we shall only present the proof of the related estimates involving $u\circ\Phi$, and the ones involving $v\circ\Phi^{-1}$ is identical. Firstly it follows from $\det(\nabla_y\Phi)=1$ that

$$\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^0}=\|u\|_{\dot H^0}.$$

When $s\in(0,1)$, we obtain from

$$\|f\|_{\dot H^s}^2\sim\int_{\mathbb{R}^2\times\mathbb{R}^2}\frac{|f(x)-f(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{2+2s}}\,dx\,dy,$$

that

$$\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^s}\lesssim(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{s+1}\|u\|_{\dot H^s}.\tag{A.2}$$

For the case $s\in(-1,0)$, we get, by using (A.1), that

$$u\circ\Phi=-(\nabla_x\cdot\nabla_x(-\Delta_x)^{-1}u)\circ\Phi=-\mathcal{B}^T\nabla_y\cdot((\nabla_x(-\Delta_x)^{-1}u)\circ\Phi),$$

which combining with (iii) of Lemma 3.4 leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^s}&\lesssim\|\nabla_y\cdot((\nabla_x(-\Delta_x)^{-1}u)\circ\Phi)\|_{\dot H^s}+\|(\mathcal{B}^T-I)\nabla_y\cdot((\nabla_x(-\Delta_x)^{-1}u)\circ\Phi)\|_{\dot H^s}\\&\lesssim(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})\|(\nabla_x(-\Delta_x)^{-1}u)\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^{s+1}}\\&\quad+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{\dot H^{s+1}}\|\nabla_y(\nabla_x(-\Delta_x)^{-1}u)\circ\Phi)\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Applying (A.1) and (A.2), one thus obtains for $s\in(-1,0)$ that

$$\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^s}\lesssim(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{s+3}\|u\|_{\dot H^s}+(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{\dot H^{s+1}}\|u\|_{L^2}.\tag{A.3}$$

Whereas we deduce from (A.1) that

$$\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^1}\lesssim\|(\nabla_xu)\circ\Phi(I+\nabla_y\Psi)\|_{L^2}\lesssim(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})\|u\|_{\dot H^1}.\tag{A.4}$$

To handle the case that $1<s\leq2$, we first use (A.1) and then Lemma 3.4 (iii) to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^s}&\lesssim\|(\nabla_xu)\circ\Phi(I+\nabla_y\Psi)\|_{\dot H^{s-1}}\\&\lesssim(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})\|(\nabla_xu)\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^{s-1}}+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{\dot H^s}\|(\nabla_xu)\circ\Phi\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}\tag{A.5}$$

which along with (A.2) and (A.4) ensures

$$\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^s}\lesssim(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{s+1}\|u\|_{\dot H^s}+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{\dot H^s}\|\nabla_xu\|_{L^2}.\tag{A.6}$$

For $k<s-1\leq k+1$ ($k\in\mathbb{N}$), applying (A.5) repeatedly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^{s-1}}&\lesssim(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^k\|(\nabla_x^ku)\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^{s-(k+1)}}\\&\quad+\sum_{j=2}^{k+1}(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{j-2}\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{\dot H^{s+1-j}}\|\nabla_x^{j-1}u\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{A.7}$$

On the other hand, thanks to (A.1) and (i) of Lemma 3.4, one has

$$\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^s}\lesssim(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})\|(\nabla_xu)\circ\Phi\|_{\dot H^{s-1}}+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{\dot H^{s-1}}\|\nabla_xu\|_{L^\infty},$$

this combining with (A.7) yields for $k+1 < s \leq k+2$ $(k \in \mathbb{N})$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot{H}^s} \lesssim& (1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{k+1}\|(\nabla_x^{k+1}u)\circ\Phi\|_{\dot{H}^{s-(k+1)}}\\ &+\sum_{j=2}^{k+1}(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{j-1}\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1-j}}\|\nabla_x^j u\|_{L^2}+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{\dot{H}^{s-1}}\|\nabla_x u\|_{L^\infty}\\ \lesssim&(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{k+1}\big(\|(\nabla_x^{k+1}u)\circ\Phi\|_{\dot{H}^{s-(k+1)}}+\|\Delta_y\Psi\|_{H^{s-2}}\|\nabla_x u\|_{H^{s-1}}\big),\end{aligned}\tag{A.8}$$

where we used the embedding inequality

$$\|\nabla_x u\|_{L^\infty}\lesssim\|\nabla_x u\|_{H^{s-1}}\quad\text{for}\quad s>2.$$

By (A.2) and (A.8), we finally obtain

$$\|u\circ\Phi\|_{\dot{H}^s}\lesssim(1+\|\nabla_y\Psi\|_{L^\infty})^{s+1}(1+\|\Delta_y\Psi\|_{H^{s-2}})\|\nabla_x u\|_{H^{s-1}}.\tag{A.9}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma A.1. □

APPENDIX B. THE PROOF OF LEMMAS 4.1 AND 4.2

Proof of Lemma 4.1. We first get by applying Bony's decomposition (3.7) and (3.8) that

$$\partial_2 Y^1\partial_1 Y_t = \big(TT^h+T\mathcal{R}^h+\bar{T}T^h+\bar{T}\bar{T}^h+\bar{T}R^h+RT^h+R\mathcal{R}^h\big)(\partial_2Y^1,\partial_1Y_t).\tag{B.1}$$

Since

$$\|\Delta_{j'}S^h_{k'+2}\partial_1Y_t(t)\|_{L^2}\lesssim d_{j',k'}(t)2^{-\frac{3j'}{2}}2^{\frac{k'}{2}}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12}}\quad\text{and since}$$

$$\|S_{j'-1}\Delta^h_{k'}\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{L^2_h(L^\infty_v)}\lesssim d_{k'}(t)2^{-\frac{k'}{2}}\|\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12}},$$

by applying Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\Delta_j\Delta^h_k(T\mathcal{R}^h(\partial_2Y^1,\partial_1Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2}\\ &\quad\lesssim 2^{\frac{k}{2}}\sum_{\substack{|j'-j|\leq4\\ j'+N_0\geq k'\geq k-N_0}}\|S_{j'-1}\Delta^h_{k'}\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{L^2_h(L^\infty_v)}\|\Delta_{j'}S^h_{k'+2}\partial_1Y_t(t)\|_{L^2}\\ &\quad\lesssim 2^{\frac{k}{2}}\sum_{\substack{|j'-j|\leq4\\ k'\geq k-N_0}}d_{j',k'}(t)2^{-j'}2^{-\frac{k'}{2}}\|\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12}}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12}}\\ &\quad\lesssim d_{j,k}(t)2^{-j}\|\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12}},\end{aligned}$$

The same estimate holds for $\|\Delta_j\Delta^h_k(TT^h(\partial_2Y^1,\partial_1Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2}$.

Following the same line of the arguments, one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\Delta_j\Delta^h_k(R\mathcal{R}^h(\partial_2Y^1,\partial_1Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2}\\ &\quad\lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}}2^{\frac{k}{2}}\sum_{\substack{j'\geq j-N_0\\ j'+N_0\geq k'\geq k-N_0}}\|\Delta_{j'}\Delta^h_{k'}\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{L^2}\|\widetilde{\Delta}_{j'}S^h_{k'+2}\partial_1Y_t(t)\|_{L^2}\\ &\quad\lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}}2^{\frac{k}{2}}\sum_{\substack{j'\geq j-N_0\\ k'\geq k-N_0}}d_{j',k'}(t)2^{-\frac{3j'}{2}}2^{-\frac{k'}{2}}\|\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12}}\\ &\quad\lesssim d_{j,k}(t)2^{-j}\|\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12}}.\end{aligned}$$

Similar estimate holds for $\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h(\bar{T}T^h(\partial_2Y^1,\partial_1Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2}$, $\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h(\bar{T}R^h(\partial_2Y^1,\partial_1Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2}$, and $\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h(RT^h(\partial_2Y^1,\partial_1Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2}$.

Finally as

$$\|S_{j'-1}S_{k'-1}^h\partial_1Y_t(t)\|_{L^\infty}\lesssim d_{k'}(t)2^{k'}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12}},$$

we get by applying Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h(\bar{T}\bar{T}^h(\partial_2Y^1,\partial_1Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2}&\lesssim\sum_{\substack{|j'-j|\leq4\\|k'-k|\leq4}}\|\Delta_{j'}\Delta_{k'}^h\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{L^2}\|S_{j'-1}S_{k'-1}^h\partial_1Y_t(t)\|_{L^\infty}\\&\lesssim\sum_{\substack{|j'-j|\leq4\\|k'-k|\leq4}}d_{j',k'}(t)2^{-j'}\|\partial_1Y^1(t)\|_{\dot{B}^2_{2,1}}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12}}\\&\lesssim d_{j,k}(t)2^{-j}\|\partial_1Y^1(t)\|_{\dot{B}^2_{2,1}}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12}}.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above estimates into (B.1) and integrating the resulting inequality over $(0,T)$, we complete the proof of Lemma 4.1. ☐

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Similar to (B.1), we get by applying Bony's decomposition (3.7) and (3.8) that

$$\partial_2Y^1\partial_2Y_t=\big(TT^h+\mathcal{R}T^h+T\bar{T}^h+\bar{T}\bar{T}^h+R\bar{T}^h+TR^h+\mathcal{R}R^h\big)(\partial_2Y^1,\partial_2Y_t).\tag{B.2}$$

Thanks to Definition 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\Delta_{j'}S_{k'-1}^h\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{L^\infty_h(L^2_v)}\lesssim d_{j'}(t)2^{-\frac{j'}{2}}\|\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12}}\quad\text{and}\\&\|S_{j'+2}\Delta_{k'}^h\partial_2Y_t(t)\|_{L^2}\lesssim d_{k'}(t)2^{-k'}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{1,1}}\lesssim d_{k'}(t)2^{-k'}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12}}.\end{aligned}\tag{B.3}$$

By applying Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.1, one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h(\mathcal{R}T^h(\partial_2Y^1,\partial_2Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2}\\&\quad\lesssim2^{\frac{j}{2}}\sum_{\substack{j'\geq j-N_0\\|k'-k|\leq4}}\|\Delta_{j'}S_{k'-1}^h\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{L^\infty_h(L^2_v)}\|S_{j'+2}\Delta_{k'}^h\partial_2Y_t(t)\|_{L^2}\\&\quad\lesssim2^{\frac{j}{2}}\sum_{\substack{j'\geq j-N_0\\|k'-k|\leq4}}d_{j',k'}(t)2^{-\frac{j'}{2}}2^{-k'}\|\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac12,\frac12}}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12}}\\&\quad\lesssim d_{j,k}(t)2^{-k}\|\partial_2Y^1(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12}}.\end{aligned}$$

The same estimate holds for $\|\Delta_j\Delta_k^h(TT^h(\partial_2Y^1,\partial_2Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2}$.

While as

$$\|\widetilde{\Delta}_{j'}S_{k'-1}^h\partial_2Y_t(t)\|_{L^\infty_h(L^2_v)}\lesssim2^{-\frac{j'}{2}}\|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac32,\frac12}},$$

and the indices $j \geq k - N_0$ in the operator $\Delta_j \Delta_k^h$, we get by applying Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.1 once again that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Delta_j \Delta_k^h (R\bar{T}^h(\partial_2 Y^1, \partial_2 Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \sum_{\substack{j' \geq j - N_0 \\ |k'-k| \leq 4}} \|\Delta_{j'} \Delta_{k'}^h \partial_2 Y^1(t)\|_{L^2} \|\widetilde{\Delta}_{j'} S_{k'-1}^h \partial_2 Y_t(t)\|_{L_h^\infty(L_v^2)} \\
&\quad \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \sum_{\substack{j' \geq j - N_0 \\ |k'-k| \leq 4}} d_{j',k'}(t) 2^{-j'} 2^{-\frac{k'}{2}} \|\partial_2 Y^1(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}} \|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}} \\
&\quad \lesssim d_{j,k}(t) 2^{-k} \|\partial_2 Y^1(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}} \|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar arguments lead to the estimates for $\|\Delta_j \Delta_k^h (T\bar{T}^h(\partial_2 Y^1, \partial_2 Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2}$ and $\|\Delta_j \Delta_k^h (\bar{T}\bar{T}^h(\partial_2 Y^1, \partial_2 Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2}$ in the same fashion.

Finally it follows from (B.3), Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Delta_j \Delta_k^h (\mathcal{R}R^h(\partial_2 Y^1, \partial_2 Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} 2^{\frac{k}{2}} \sum_{\substack{j' \geq j - N_0 \\ k' \geq k - N_0}} \|\Delta_{j'} \Delta_{k'}^h \partial_2 Y^1(t)\|_{L^2} \|S_{j'+2} \widetilde{\Delta}_{k'}^h \partial_2 Y_t(t)\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} 2^{\frac{k}{2}} \sum_{\substack{j' \geq j - N_0 \\ k' \geq k - N_0}} d_{j',k'}(t) 2^{-\frac{j'}{2}} 2^{-\frac{3k'}{2}} \|\partial_2 Y^1(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}} \|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{1,1}} \\
&\quad \lesssim d_{j,k}(t) 2^{-k} \|\partial_2 Y^1(t)\|_{\dot{B}^1_{2,1}} \|Y_t(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The same estimate again holds for $\|\Delta_j \Delta_k^h (TR^h(\partial_2 Y^1, \partial_2 Y_t))(t)\|_{L^2}$.

Substituting the above estimates into (B.2) and integrating the resulting inequality over $(0, T)$ finishes the proof of Lemma 4.2. □

APPENDIX C. THE PROOF OF LEMMA 6.1

Proof of Lemma 6.1. We first deduce from (2.2) that $\tilde{\psi}_0$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} (1 + \partial_{x_2}\psi_0)\partial_{x_1}\tilde{\psi}_0 - \partial_{x_1}\psi_0 \partial_{x_2}\tilde{\psi}_0 = \partial_{x_2}\psi_0, \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^2, \\ \tilde{\psi}_0(0, x_2) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{C.1}$$

For simplicity, we shall solve (C.1) on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, it is easy to observe by characteristic method and by mollifying ψ_0 appropriately that we can construct smooth enough approximate solutions to (C.1). Then the lemma follows from the uniform estimate to this approximate solutions and a standard compactness argument. For simplicity, we shall present the *a priori* estimate (6.16) to smooth enough solutions of (C.1). Indeed, we first get by using standard energy estimate that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\psi}_0(x_1, \cdot)\|_{L_v^2}^2 = &- \int_0^{x_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_{x_2} \Big[\frac{\partial_{x_1}\psi_0}{1 + \partial_{x_2}\psi_0} \Big] |\tilde{\psi}_0|^2 \, dx_2 \, dz_1 \\ &+ 2 \int_0^{x_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}{1 + \partial_{x_2}\psi_0} \tilde{\psi}_0 \, dx_2 \, dz_1. \end{aligned} \tag{C.2}$$

Note from Definition 1.1 that

$$\|\nabla\psi_0(x_1, \cdot)\|_{L_v^\infty} \leq \|\nabla\psi_0(x_1, \cdot)\|_{H_v^1} \leq C\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{2,s}} \leq C\varepsilon,$$

so that for $s>1$ and ε small enough

$$\int_0^{x_1}\|\partial_{x_2}\Big[\frac{\partial_{x_1}\psi_0}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}\Big]\|_{L^\infty_{\rm v}}\,dz_1\leq C\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{3,s}}\int_0^{x_1}\langle z_1\rangle^{-s}\,dz_1\leq C\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{3,s}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_0^{x_1}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\partial_{x_2}\Big[\frac{\partial_{x_1}\psi_0}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}\Big]|\tilde{\psi}_0|^2\,dx_2\Big|\leq&\int_0^{x_1}\|\partial_{x_2}\Big[\frac{\partial_{x_1}\psi_0}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}\Big]\|_{L^\infty_{\rm v}}\,dz_1\|\tilde{\psi}_0\|^2_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_{\rm v})}\\ \leq&C\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{3,s}}\|\tilde{\psi}_0\|^2_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_{\rm v})}.\end{aligned}\tag{C.3}$$

By a similar argument, we have

$$\Big|\int_0^{x_1}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}\tilde{\psi}_0\,dx_2\,dz_1\Big|\leq C\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{2,s}}\langle x_1\rangle^{1-s}\|\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_{\rm v})}.\tag{C.4}$$

Then we infer from (C.2)-(C.4) that

$$(\frac{1}{2}-C\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{3,s}})\|\tilde{\psi}_0\|^2_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_{\rm v})}\leq C\|\psi_0\|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{2,s}}\langle x_1\rangle^{2(1-s)}.$$

Taking ε so small that $\varepsilon\leq\frac{1}{4C}$, one thus obtains

$$\|\tilde{\psi}_0\|^2_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_{\rm v})}\leq C\|\psi_0\|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{2,s}}\langle x_1\rangle^{2(1-s)}.\tag{C.5}$$

Inductively we assume that for $1\leq j\leq k-1$, there holds

$$\max_{|\alpha|\leq j}\sup_{x_1\in(0,\infty)}\big\{\langle x_1\rangle^{s-1}\|\partial^\alpha\tilde{\psi}_0(x_1,\cdot)\|_{L^2_{\rm v}}\big\}\leq C_j\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{j+1,s}}.\tag{C.6}$$

We shall prove that (C.6) holds for $|\alpha|=j+1$. Toward this, we get first by taking ∂^α with $|\alpha|=j+1$ to (C.1) and then taking the $L^2_{\rm v}$ inner product of the resulting equation with $\partial^\alpha\tilde{\psi}_0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial^\alpha\tilde{\psi}_0(x_1,\cdot)\|^2_{L^2_{\rm v}}=&-\int_0^{x_1}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\partial_{x_2}\Big[\frac{\partial_{x_1}\psi_0}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}\Big]\big(\partial^\alpha\tilde{\psi}_0\big)^2\,dx_2\,dz_1\\ &+2\int_0^{x_1}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{\partial^\alpha\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}\partial^\alpha\tilde{\psi}_0\,dx_2\,dz_1+2\sum_{\substack{\alpha_1+\alpha_2=\alpha\\|\alpha_1|\geq1}}C_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2}A_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2},\end{aligned}\tag{C.7}$$

where

$$A_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2}\stackrel{\rm def}{=}\int_0^{x_1}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\big[\partial^{\alpha_1}(\frac{\partial_{x_1}\psi_0}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0})\partial^{\alpha_2}\partial_{x_2}\tilde{\psi}_0+\partial^{\alpha_1}(\frac{1}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0})\partial^{\alpha_2}\partial_{x_2}\psi_0\big]\partial^\alpha\tilde{\psi}_0\,dx_2\,dz_1.$$

As for (C.3), it leads to

$$\Big|\int_0^{x_1}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\partial_{x_2}\Big[\frac{\partial_{x_1}\psi_0}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}\Big]\big(\partial^\alpha\tilde{\psi}_0\big)^2\,dx_2\,dz_1\Big|\leq C\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{3,s}}\|\partial^\alpha\tilde{\psi}_0\|^2_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_{\rm v})},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{\alpha_1+\alpha_2=\alpha\\|\alpha_1|=1}}|A_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2}|\leq&C\big(\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{3,s}}\max_{|\alpha|=j+1}\|\partial^\alpha\tilde{\psi}_0\|^2_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_{\rm v})}\\ &+\|\psi_0\|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{j+1,s}}\langle x_1\rangle^{2(1-s)}\|\partial^\alpha\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_{\rm v})}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Whereas for α_1 satisfying $2 \leq |\alpha_1| \leq j$, we deduce from (C.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\int_0^{x_1}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial^{\alpha_1}\big(\frac{\partial_{x_1}\psi_0}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}\big)\partial^{\alpha_2}\partial_{x_2}\tilde{\psi}_0\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0\,dx_2\,dz_1\Big|\\
&\leq \int_0^{x_1}\big\|\partial^{\alpha_1}\big(\frac{\partial_{x_1}\psi_0}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}\big)\big\|_{L^\infty_v}\langle z_1\rangle^{1-s}\,dz_1 \sup_{x_1\in(0,\infty)}\{\langle x_1\rangle^{s-1}\|\partial^{\alpha_2}\partial_{x_2}\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L^2_v}\}\|\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_v)}\\
&\leq C_{j+1}\|\psi_0\|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{j+2,s}}\langle x_1\rangle^{2(1-s)}\|\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_v)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Along the same line, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\int_0^{x_1}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial^{\alpha_1}\big(\frac{1}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}\big)\partial^{\alpha_2}\partial_{x_2}\psi_0\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0\,dx_2\,dz_1\Big|\\
&\leq \int_0^{x_1}\big\|\partial^{\alpha_1}\big(\frac{1}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}\big)\big\|_{L^\infty_v}\langle z_1\rangle^{1-s}\,dz_1 \sup_{x_1\in(0,\infty)}\{\langle x_1\rangle^{s}\|\partial^{\alpha_2}\partial_{x_2}\psi_0\|_{L^2_v}\}\|\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_v)}\\
&\leq C_{j+1}\|\psi_0\|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{j+2,s}}\langle x_1\rangle^{2(1-s)}\|\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_v)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two estimates, we arrive at

$$\sum_{\substack{\alpha_1+\alpha_2=\alpha\\ |\alpha|-1\geq|\alpha_1|\geq 2}} |A_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2}| \leq C_{j+1}\|\psi_0\|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{j+2,s}}\langle x_1\rangle^{2(1-s)}\|\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_v)}.$$

Similar argument gives rise to that

$$|A_{\alpha,0}| \leq C_{j+1}\|\psi_0\|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{j+2,s}}\langle x_1\rangle^{2(1-s)}\|\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_v)}.$$

And it is easy to check that

$$\Big|\int_0^{x_1}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{\partial^{\alpha}\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}{1+\partial_{x_2}\psi_0}\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0\,dx_2\,dz_1\Big| \leq C_{j+1}\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{j+2,s}}\langle x_1\rangle^{1-s}\|\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_v)}.$$

As a consequence, we obtain from (C.7) that

$$\max_{|\alpha|=j+1}\big\{\big(\frac{1}{2}-C\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{3,s}}\big)\|\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0\|^2_{L^\infty_{(0,x_1)}(L^2_v)}\big\} \leq C_{j+1}\|\psi_0\|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{j+2,s}}\langle x_1\rangle^{2(1-s)} \quad \text{for} \quad |\alpha| = j+1.$$

This in turn proves that (C.6) holds for $|\alpha| \leq j+1$ as long as $\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{3,s}} \leq \frac{1}{4C}$. Therefore, we obtain for $s > 1$ that

$$\max_{|\alpha|\leq k}\sup_{x_1\in(0,\infty)}\big\{\langle x_1\rangle^{s-1}\|\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0(x_1,\cdot)\|_{L^2_v}\big\} \leq C_k\|\psi_0\|_{\mathcal{A}_{k+1,s}}. \tag{C.8}$$

The proof to the same estimate for $x < 0$ is identical.

Finally thanks to (C.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{\psi}_0\|^2_{H^k(\mathbb{R}^2)} &= \sum_{|\alpha|\leq k}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\big(\partial^{\alpha}\tilde{\psi}_0\big)^2\,dx_2\,dx_1\\
&\lesssim \|\tilde{\psi}_0\|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{k,s-1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\langle x_1\rangle^{2(1-s)}\,dx_1 \leq C_{k,s}\|\psi_0\|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{k+1,s}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.9}$$

provided that $s > \frac{3}{2}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 6.1. □

Acknowledgments. F. Lin is partially supported by the NSF grant DMS 0700517. P. Zhang is partially supported by NSF of China under Grant 10421101 and 10931007, the one hundred talents' plan from Chinese Academy of Sciences under Grant GJHZ200829 and innovation grant from the National Center for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences, CAS.

References

[1] H. Bahouri, J. Y. Chemin and R. Danchin, *Fourier Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations,* Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Springer 2011.

[2] J. M. Bony, Calcul symbolique et propagation des singularités pour les q́uations aux d??rivées partielles non linéaires, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, **14**(4) (1981), 209–246.

[3] H. Cabannes, *Theoretical Magneto-Fluid Dynamics,* Academic Press, New York, London, 1970.

[4] C. Cao and J. Wu, Global regularity for the 2D MHD equations with mixed partial dissipation and magnetic diffusion, *Adv. Math.*, **226** (2011), 1803-1822.

[5] J. Y. Chemin, B. Desjardins, I. Gallagher and E. Grenier, Fluids with anisotropic viscosity, *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, **34** (2000), 315-335.

[6] J. Y. Chemin and P. Zhang, On the global wellposedness to the 3-D incompressible anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **272** (2007), 529–566.

[7] Y. Chen and P. Zhang, The global existence of small solutions to the incompressible viscoelastic fluid System in general space dimensions, *Comm. P. D. E.*, **31** (2006), 1793-1810.

[8] C. Chiuderi and F. Califano, *Phy. Rev. E*, **60** (1999), 4701-4707.

[9] R. Danchin, Global existence in critical spaces for compressible Navier-Stokes equations, *Invent. Math.*, **141** (2000), 579-614.

[10] T. G. Cowling and D. Phil, *Magnetohydrodynnamics*, the Institute of Physics, 1976.

[11] G. Gui, J. Huang and P. Zhang, Large global solutions to the $3-$D inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Funct. Anal.* , **261** (2011), 3181-3210;

[12] D. Iftimie, The resolution of the Navier-Stokes equations in anisotropic spaces, *Rev.Mat.Iberoamericana*, **15** (1999), 1–36.

[13] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Electrodynamics of Continuous Media*, 2nd ed. Pergaman, New York, 1984.

[14] Z. Lei, C. Liu and Y. Zhou, Global solutions for incompressible viscoelastic fluids, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **188** (2008), 371-398.

[15] F. Lin, Some analytical issues for elastic complex fluids, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, (2012) in press.

[16] F. Lin, C. Liu and P. Zhang, On the hydrodynamics of visco-elasicity, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **58** (2005), 1437-1471.

[17] F. Lin and P. Zhang, On the initial-boundary value problem of the incompressible viscoelastic fluid system, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.*, **61** (2008), 539-558.

[18] F. Lin and P. Zhang, Global small solutions to MHD type system (I): 3-D case, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.* to appear.

[19] A. Majda, *Compressible fluid flow and systems of conservation laws in several space variables,* Applied Mathematical Sciences, 53. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.

[20] M. Paicu, Équation anisotrope de Navier-Stokes dans des espaces critiques, *Revista Matematica Iberoamericana*, **21** (2005), 179–235.

[21] M. Paicu and P. Zhang, Global solutions to the 3-D incompressible anisotropic Navier-Stokes system in the critical spaces, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **307** (2011), 713-759.

[22] Li Xu, Ping Zhang and Zhifei Zhang, Global solvability to a free boundary 3-D incompressible viscoelastic fluid system with surface tension, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, (2013) in press.

[23] T. Zhang, Erratum to: Global wellposed problem for the 3-D incompressible anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations in an anisotropic space, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **295** (2010), 877-884.

(F. Lin) Courant Institute, New York University, New York, NY 10012
E-mail address: `linf@cims.nyu.edu`

(L. Xu) LSEC, Institute of Computational Mathematics, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, CAS, Beijing 100190, CHINA
E-mail address: `xuliice@lsec.cc.ac.cn`

(P. Zhang) Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science and Hua Loo-Keng Key Laboratory of Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, CHINA
E-mail address: `zp@amss.ac.cn`